

Never the Twain Shall Meet?

Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica

Herausgegeben von
Sergei Mariev

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat:
John Demetracopoulos, Jozef Matula,
John Monfasani, Inmaculada Pérez Martín,
Brigitte Tambrun-Krasker

Band 2

Never the Twain Shall Meet?

Latins and Greeks learning from each other in Byzantium

Edited by
Denis Searby

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-055958-3
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-056107-4
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-055973-6
ISSN 1864-9785

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2018 Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/Boston
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck
♾ Printed on acid-free paper
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Acknowledgements

This volume would not have been possible without the generous support of the Swedish Research Council (*Vetenskapsrådet*) that funded the Stockholm University conference “Never the Twain” (June 24–26, 2015) which was the basis for the papers collected here. Also to be thanked in this connection are the *Harald och Tonny Hagendahls minnesfond* which provided additional funding as well as the Department of Romance Studies and Classics at Stockholm University which hosted the conference, and Astrid Söderbergh Widding, the Vice Chancellor of the university, for her words of welcome inspiration that opened the conference. Naturally, the contributing authors as well as the anonymous reviewers are also to be thanked for all their hard work. A special note of gratitude is due to Professor Sergei Mariev, the editor of the *Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica*, and to his team of highly effective typesetters who worked with impressive celerity once they received the final versions of the papers.

Stockholm, May 2017

Denis Searby

Contents

List of Contributors — IX

Denis M. Searby

Foreword — 1

Franz Tinnefeld

Translations from Latin to Greek — 9

Marcus Plested

**Reconfiguring East and West in Byzantine and Modern Orthodox
Theology — 21**

John Monfasani

George of Trebizond, Thomas Aquinas, and Latin Scholasticism — 47

Antoine Levy

Translatable and Untranslatable Aquinas — 63

Panagiotis C. Athanasopoulos

Bessarion of Nicaea vs. Mark Eugenicus — 77

Irini Balcoyiannopoulou

**New Evidence on the Manuscript Tradition and on the Latin and Greek Background
to George Scholarius' *In "De Interpretatione"* — 93**

Marie-Hélène Blanchet

The Two Byzantine Translations of Thomas Aquinas' *De Rationibus Fidei* — 115

John A. Demetracopoulos

**Scholarios' *On Almsgiving*, or How to Convert a Scholastic “Quaestio” into a
Sermon — 129**

Pantelis Golitsis

ἐσέντζια, ὄντότης, οὐσία — 179

Brian M. Jensen

Hugo Eterianus and his Two Treatises in the Demetrius of Lampe Affair — 197

Christian W. Kappes

Gregorios Palamas' Reception of Augustine's Doctrine of the Original Sin and Nicholas Kabasilas' Rejection of Aquinas' Maculism as the Background to Scholarios' Immaculism — 207

Michail Konstantinou-Rizos

Prochoros Cydones' Translation of Thomas Aquinas' *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia* and *Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis* — 259

Sergei Mariev

Nature as *instrumentum Dei* — 275

Tikhon Alexander Pino

Hylomorphism East and West — 291

Georgios Steiris

Pletho, Scholarios and Arabic philosophy — 309

Selected Bibliography — 335

Index — 355

List of Contributors

Panagiotis C. Athanasopoulos, PhD is a research assistant at the Department of Humanities, Ca'Foscari University of Venice, and a collaborator of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* research project (2007–). His interests include Christian Literature, and Greek and Latin Medieval Philosophy. Currently, he is working on the *Editio Princeps* of the Greek *Translation of Thomas Aquinas' Summa Theologiae Ia IIae* by Demetrios Cydones and its incomplete *Compendium* by Bessarion.

Irini Balcoyianopoulou is a doctoral student at the Department of Education, University of Patras, Greece. The title of her ongoing dissertation is *The Logical Handbooks of George Scholarios-Gennadios II: Method, Sources and Innovations*. Her research interests focus on the reception of Latin philosophical thought in late Byzantium, mainly its philological and historical aspect. Since 2014, she is a member of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* research project.

Marie-Hélène Blanchet, PhD, is a research fellow at CNRS (UMR 8167 Orient et Méditerranée, Monde byzantin) in Paris. Her research focuses on the intellectual and religious history of the Byzantine Empire during the Palaiologan period (13th–15th centuries). Among other works, she is the author of *Georges Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472): un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'Empire byzantin* (Paris 2008), and *Théodore Agallianos, Dialogue avec un moine contre les Latins* (1442) (Paris 2013). She is working on three critical editions within the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* project, the two Greek translations of Aquinas' *De rationibus fidei*, and two works by Matthew Angelos Panaretos.

John A. Demetracopoulos is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Theology at the Department of Education, University of Patras, Greece. His main scholarly interests are Greek and Latin Medieval philosophy and theology, with an emphasis on the philological evidence of the Greek-Latin philosophical and theological interaction in the Late Middle Ages and the post-Byzantine era. He is the director of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* international research project (2007–), currently sponsored by the Stavros Niarchos Foundation. He is the author of numerous scholarly publications, including the monograph *Από τὴν ἱστορία τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ θωμισμοῦ Πλήθων καὶ Θωμᾶς Ἀκυνάτης* (Plethon and Thomas Aquinas, Athens 2004), and the forthcoming *The Christian Platonism of Barlaam the Calabrian: In Search of the Theological and Philosophical Sources of His Greek Epistles*.

Pantelis Golitsis is Assistant Professor of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. He is the author of *Les Commentaires de Simplicius et de Jean Philopon à la Physique d'Aristote. Tradition et innovation* (Berlin & New York, 2008; Prix Zographos de l'Association pour l'encouragement des Études Grecques en France), of a Modern Greek translation and commentary of Aristotle's *Progression of Animals* and *Motion of Animals* (Athens, 2017), and of several articles on ancient and Byzantine philosophy. He currently works on a new critical edition of Alexander of Aphrodisias' commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.

Brian M. Jensen is Associate Professor of Latin and a member of the Ars edendi research programme at the Department of Romance Studies and Classics at Stockholm University. His main fields of research include medieval Latin liturgy and hagiography, the Rule of St Benedict, the speeches of Cicero, and the fable genre. He has published numerous works on tropes, sequences and hagiography. His latest

publications are *The Story of Justina and Cyprian of Antioch as told in a Medieval Lectionary from Piacenza* (Stockholm 2012) and the *editio princeps* of *Lectionarium Placentinum. Edition of a Twelfth Century Lectionary for the Divine Office I-IV* (Florence 2016–17).

Rev. Dr. Christiaan Kappes is the academic dean and professor of dogmatics of the Byzantine Catholic Seminary of Ss. Cyril and Methodius (Pittsburgh). His research is focused on the Greek reception of Scholasticism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, especially Trinitarian theology, liturgiology and Mariology. He is working on *The Epiclesis Debate: Mark of Ephesus and John Torquemada, OP, at the Council of Florence 1439* for Notre Dame University Press, and on his doctoral thesis *The Theology of the Divine Essence and Energies in George-Gennadios Scholarios* (at Aristotle University in Thessaloniki).

Michail Konstantinou-Rizos studied at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens and pursued his doctoral studies at the Royal Holloway, University of London, where he has recently defended his PhD thesis: *An edition of Prochoros Cydones' (ca. 1330–1369/71) unpublished Greek translation of Thomas Aquinas' Quaestiones disputatae de potentia and Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*. He is a member of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* research project.

Antoine Levy, PhD is a Dominican priest and vice-director of Studium Catholicum in Helsinki, Finland where he moved after undergraduate studies at Sorbonne Paris-IV and ENS (St Cloud) as well as graduate studies at Sorbonne Paris-IV and in Italy (Pontificia Università San Tommaso d'Aquino) and doctoral studies at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland. He is an adjunct professor of theology at the University of Helsinki and a professor of Russian Ideas and Religions at the University of Eastern Finland. Among his publications is the monograph *Le créé et l'incréé: Maxime le Confesseur et Thomas d'Aquin: aux sources de la querelle palamienne* (Paris 2006).

Sergei Mariev is an Associate Professor at the Institut für Byzantinistik, Byzantinische Kunstgeschichte und Neogräzistik of the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München. He completed his BA in Classics and Classical Civilization at Brigham Young University, Utah, USA in 1996, and later received his Master (2002) and Ph.D. (2005) in Classics, Byzantine Studies and Latin Philology of the Middle Ages from LMU Munich. His *Habilitationsschrift* with the title *Ästhetische Theorien in Byzanz* (2013) explores the reception of the Neoplatonic theories of beauty and the development of image theory in Byzantium. Among his other recent works are *Bessarion: Über Natur und Kunst* (Hamburg 2015), and *Ioannis Antiocheni fragmenta quae supersunt omnia* (Berlin 2008). He is the founder and editor-in-chief of *Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica*.

John Monfasani is a Distinguished Professor Emeritus of the University at Albany, State University of New York. He received his BA at Fordham University in 1965 and his doctorate in history under Eugene F. Rice, Jr., and Paul Oskar Kristeller at Columbia University in 1973. His special fields of interest have been Renaissance Humanism and Byzantine émigrés to Renaissance Italy. He has published almost a hundred articles to date and fourteen books, with critical editions of George of Trebizond's *Comparatio Philosophorum Platonis et Aristotelis* and *Protectio Problematum Aristotelis* forthcoming.

Tikhon Pino is a PhD Candidate at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA. He has published articles on hylomorphic theory in Aristotle and Plotinus, on the Trinitarian theology of Maximus the Confessor and Bonaventure, and on the metaphysics of Philo of Alexandria. He is currently

completing his dissertation: “The Palamite School: The Followers of St. Gregory Palamas and the Reception of the Essence-Energies Distinction.”

Marcus Plested (D.Phil., Oxford University, 1999) is Associate Professor of Greek Patristic and Byzantine Theology at Marquette University (Milwaukee, Wisconsin). Previously he was Vice-Principal and Academic Director of the Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies (Cambridge). He has been a member of the Center of Theological Inquiry and the Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton) and has taught, lectured, and published widely in patristic, Byzantine, and modern Orthodox theology. He is the author of two books: *The Macarian Legacy: The Place of Macarius-Symeon in the Eastern Christian Tradition* (Oxford: OUP 2004) and *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas* (Oxford: OUP 2012).

Georgios Steiris is currently Associate Professor of Medieval and Renaissance Philosophy at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. He has also taught at the University of Peloponnese, the Paideia Program at the University of Connecticut and the Hellenic Open University. His most recent publications include: *The Problem of Modern Greek Identity: from the Ecumene to the Nation-State*, eds. G. Steiris, S. Mitralexis, G. Arabatzis (Newcastle 2016), and *Maximus the Confessor as a European Philosopher*, eds. S. Mitralexis, G. Steiris, S. Lalla, M. Podbielski (Eugene OR 2017).

Franz Tinnefeld is retired Professor of Byzantine Studies (LMU Munich). He studied Catholic Theology, Classical and Slavic Philology and Byzantinology at the Universities of Bonn and Munich, was awarded his PhD in 1962 at the University of Bonn for a dissertation on the textual history of the New Testament and received his *Habilitation* in Byzantine Studies at LMU Munich in 1971. He has published important studies of the social structures of the early Byzantine Empire, social and political aspects of the later empire, and has translated Demetrios Kydones’ correspondence. His most recent book is *Die Briefe des Demetrios Kydones. Themen und literarische Form* (Wiesbaden 2010).

Denis M. Searby

Foreword

The poster of the conference on which this volume is based shows the Valens Aqueduct as it may have looked in thirteenth century Constantinople. This fourth century aqueduct, which is still standing in modern Istanbul, appears to divide the city in two, and thus is an apt symbol of division; yet it is symbolic in other ways as well. Its construction was ordered by a Latin-speaking emperor, reminding us, obviously, that the Byzantine East in its very foundations was conjoined with the Latin West. Moreover, though in one respect the aqueduct may be said to separate, in another it unites. It united, of course, the water of the hills with the reservoirs of the city, but, in so doing, it also united people; it was and is like a bridge. This serves as a reminder that at least some of the perceived divisions between East and West – even the tiresome Filioque controversy – may on closer examination reveal an underlying unity.

This volume of papers, like the conference, was conceived as a means of shedding light on the mutuality of theological and philosophical methods and interests in the two halves of the former Roman Empire in its final period, to emphasize the lively intellectual engagement between “Latins” and “Greeks” of the Palaeologan period as well as the long-lasting repercussions of the dialogue between them. Historically speaking, the volume concentrates primarily on the period from the reconquest of Constantinople in 1261 by Michael VIII Palaiologos up to the aftermath of the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453, a period covering cataclysmic political, philosophical and theological developments, including the ill-fated but tremendously important attempt at ecclesial union at the Council of Florence-Ferrara (1437–39) and the stream of Greek emigrés to the West once their capital city had fallen; it was a period that saw the end of the Middle Ages and a new world discovered in 1492, transforming all previous conceptions of East and West. A reader equipped only with general knowledge of the Fourth Crusade of 1204, which resulted in the subjugation of Constantinople under Frankish power for six decades, and formed by perceptions of some fundamental dichotomy between Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy, cannot but be astonished to discover not only translations of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas into Greek at this time along with an appropriation of Western scholastic ideas and methods in Constantinople but also an impressive knowledge of Latin theology and philosophy among Byzantine intellectuals throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

During the first half of the twentieth century, scholars, in particular Catholic scholars and especially Martin Jugie (1878–1954), published a number of studies and editions of these Thomistically-minded Byzantines, provoking responses from Orthodox theologians, such as John Meyendorff (1926–1992), among others. Though Jugie’s works were solid, even great, contributions to scholarship, they could be put to polemical use and, thus, bore the taint of controversialism. This volume is intended

to transcend the confines of confessional scholarship, to move beyond the stereotypes and point the way to a more nuanced understanding of the dialogue between Eastern and Western Europe during the late Middle Ages – for the papers collected here show that it was a dialogue, at least in its early stages, if not always friendly, and that, happily, it is once more becoming a dialogue, that is, a genuine exchange of ideas and scholarship.

Since several of these papers pursue their arguments in great philological detail, this foreword is an attempt to summarize certain essential points in order to aid the reader. The first paper itself provides a framework for the remainder of the volume. In it Franz Tinnefeld sets the stage for the ensuing discussion with a clear presentation of one of the most basic forms of intellectual exchange, namely, translation. In the past forty years, translation studies have burgeoned into a fertile field of research detailing the impact of translation on society throughout literate history, although the impact on Byzantine society and subsequently on Greek and Slavic Orthodoxy of the translations of Latin theological works into Greek remains relatively unknown to many scholars. Two pivotal figures dominate Tinnefeld's presentation, Maximos Planoudes, the learned monk of the late thirteenth century, and Demetrios Kydones, a leading statesman of the fourteenth. Likewise, two of their translation projects in particular had a philosophical and theological impact that will reverberate throughout the papers contained in this volume. Although Planoudes translated much besides, not least Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, his translation of Augustine's *De trinitate* will emerge as a source not only for the “latinophrones” but also for, more significantly, Gregory Palamas and his followers. Furthermore, Demetrios Kydones' enthusiasm for the thought of Thomas Aquinas, which resulted in translations of the *Summa contra gentiles* and the *Summa theologiae*, provides the framework for much of the intellectual exchange between the “Latin West” and the “Greek East” studied in the remainder of this volume. If one were not already cognizant of the fact but only informed by modern perceptions of the differences between Roman Catholicism and Greek Orthodoxy, who would expect to discover an enthusiastic reception of Aquinas as well as translations of his works from one moribund language to another in fourteenth century Byzantium?

It was the discrepancy between the Byzantine reception of Thomas Aquinas and our own expectations of “clearly delineated theological and ecclesial categories” of East and West that furnished a starting-point for Marcus Plested's exploration of the construction of these categorical concepts in his book *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas* (2012). In his contribution to the present volume, he revisits and develops this topic. Plested shows that assumptions of a fundamental doctrinal or methodological dichotomy between eastern and western theology are not an accurate reflection of the historical sources. Rather, there was a presupposition of harmony and compatibility on both sides in the late Middle Ages as well as in the early modern period. He traces the beginnings of a pervasive and “instinctive anti-Westernism within Orthodox theology” to the Russian Slavophile movement of the nineteenth century, in reaction to the “policy of Westernisation favoured by Peter the Great and his successors” as well as to

the thitherto dominant Thomistic and scholastic traditions in the theological schools of the Russian Empire. After pointing out the influence of German idealism on Slavic anti-Westernism, Plested goes on to discuss the construction of the identities of the cataphatic and rationalizing West (think Augustine and Aquinas) and the apophatic and mystical East (think pseudo-Dionysius and Palamas) in the leading Orthodox theologians of the twentieth century. Toward the end of his paper, “to explode the notion of an inherent East-West dichotomy”, Plested returns to the Middle Ages, pointing to Palamas’ serious engagement with Augustine, and to the fact that it was precisely Aquinas’ use of the Greek tradition that fired Kydones’ enthusiasm. He also discusses the scholasticism of the anti-unionist Mark Eugenikos and that fervent Thomist but committed Palamite, George Gennadios Scholarios, patriarch of Constantinople, who will figure amply in these pages. In his conclusions, Plested conjectures that the oppositional mode of Orthodox self-definition was more suited to the Cold War period of clearly defined blocks, whereas in our globalized era we are better positioned to “eschew simplistic dichotomies”.

Let us now consider another supposed dichotomy, that between scholasticism and humanism. The engagement of Byzantine intellectuals with Latin scholasticism took place primarily in the form of an encounter with Thomism during the late thirteenth century and onwards. This encounter lasted throughout the fourteenth and up to and beyond the fall of Constantinople, acting as an important stimulus to the final blossoming of Byzantine thought and Byzantine humanism, what we sometimes refer to as the Palaeologan Renaissance. Humanists like Demetrios Kydones, his friends and students Andreas and Theodore Chrysoberges, Manuel Chrysoloras, and others later on, such as the famous Cardinal Bessarion, as well as many other Greek humanists took a tremendous interest in and expressed admiration of Thomas Aquinas and his brand of scholastic Aristotelianism. There is a deep irony in this. At a time when Petrarch was lamenting the low level of learning in the West and was complaining about the “noisy, crazy crowd of scholastics” (*insanum et clamorum scolasticorum vulgus*), a number of Byzantine Greeks were studying Thomistic Aristotelianism. As John Monfasani makes abundantly clear in his paper, George of Trebizond (1395–1484) not only resists facile labelling as belonging to either East or West but also “fractures the supposed wall between humanism and Scholasticism”. As Monfasani notes, George, “despite being one of the leading humanists of the Quattrocento and one of the most important, if not the most important authority on rhetoric in the Renaissance up to the second half of the sixteenth century ... vigorously and vociferously defended Scholasticism against the attacks of its critics.” Neither, however, can George be classed among the Byzantine Thomists, at least not without a number of qualifications, the first of which is simply that he moved to Italy from his native Crete at too young an age to be counted among them. Examining George’s *Comparatio Philosophorum Platonis et Aristotelis* (1457), Monfasani finds that he took positions contrary to Aquinas on four out of five key philosophical issues. George was not a Byzantine Aristotelian nor a Byzantine Thomist but rather “a Greek émigré who enthusiastically em-

braced the philosophical and theological traditions of his new home” and “a Latin Aristotelian with a knowledge of Greek”. Who is Latin, who is Greek? What is East, what is West? In his very person George of Trebizond challenges us to rethink the way we use these labels.

Here I must pause to say a word about the internal arrangement of the papers in this volume. Tinnefeld, Plested and Monfasani were three of the four keynote speakers at the conference in Stockholm, and for this reason their papers are placed first. Because it raises broad issues relevant to the volume as a whole, Antoine Levy’s paper follows these three. After this the papers are arranged alphabetically by author’s surname. The fourth keynote speaker was John Demetracopoulos, whose lecture dealt with “The Essence of Speculative Thought in ‘East’ and ‘West’ in light of Latin into Greek Translations” and who offered participants a long and detailed list of translations in a handout. In the end, Demetracopoulos preferred not to publish his lecture at the conference, opting instead to submit a more specialized study, which explains why it is placed among the alphabetically arranged papers. As the driving force behind the project *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus*, John Demetracopoulos was essential to the success of the conference and his research is mentioned in nearly every paper in this volume.

Now to resume my sketch of the contents of the papers, Antoine Levy questions the apparent incompatibility of Aquinas and Palamas, a tenet of the Orthodox identity discussed by Plested. The controversy regarding Palamism revolved at first around the doctrinal issue of the distinction between God’s essence and his operations or energies but subsequently expanded to become a discussion on the meaning of deification. Before entering the thick of the debate, however, Levy first ruminates on problems inherent in translations and on the concept of retroversion, i. e. the process of translating a translation back into its original language. Paradoxically, a “bad” translation is one that reveals more of the untranslatable genius of the original than the typically “good” translation that manages to build a semantic economy equivalent to that of the original, thus masking in its smoothness the untranslatable greatness of the original. Levy claims that Demetrios Kydones, deeply impressed with the “Greekness” of Aquinas, intended his translations of Thomas to be a means of giving back to Byzantine thinkers an awareness of their own tradition. However, this new reading of the Greek Fathers through Latin lenses so unsettled these Greek-speakers that the “retroversion” gave rise to impressions of dogmatic incompatibility between the two poles on the theological compass represented by Thomas Aquinas and Gregory Palamas. Feeding these impressions were Kydones’ own anti-Palamism and the use of Kydones’ translations by the anti-Palamite faction as well as the lingering effects of the condemnation of certain Greek theses by William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris, in 1241. At the heart of the whole controversy concerning the “divine energies” lies, according to Levy, a difference in cosmic perspective that is obscured in the process of translating. Palamas views the doctrine from the perspective of God’s perfections emanating to the realm of created things, God manifesting himself through a plurality of attributes, whereas

Aquinas views deification from the perspective of the multiple ways in which rational creation receives the divine outpourings or supernatural grace. Aquinas' emphasis on the creature's receptivity to God seemed to obscure his affirmation of God's essential incomprehensibility, while Palamas' emphasis on the eternal energies seemed to obscure God's essential simplicity as well as the inseparable character of divine essence and divine energies. Yet the two theologians are viewing the same phenomenon from two different angles, Levy claims, and their supposed incompatibility is a mirage: the anti-Palamite stance of Kydones and his colleagues was not that of Thomas Aquinas who, it turns out, understood the Greek tradition better than his Greek translator.

All the remaining papers but one document the Byzantines' thoroughgoing engagement with Latin scholasticism in the final centuries of the Empire. The one exception is Brian Jensen's paper dealing with Hugo Eterianus (1115–1185), an example, one might suppose, of Latins and Greeks not learning from each other. It is also the one paper specifically dealing with the Filioque controversy, that bugbear of ecumenists. However, Hugo as well as his brother Leo Tuscus did at least learn Greek from the Greek-speakers and both did in their different ways supply Greek-speakers with knowledge of both Latin theology and political affairs. Jensen thus highlights the role of bilingualism and translation that is the *sine qua non* of intellectual exchange between language communities and that forms the pre-text of this volume.

Also dealing specifically with translations are the papers by Marie-Hélène Blanchet and Michail Konstantinou-Rizos, both of whom are editing Byzantine translations of Latin works. Konstantinou-Rizos analyzes the translation style of the other Kydones, Prochoros the monk, who predeceased his older brother Demetrios by many years. He takes a look at Prochoros' translations of two treatises by Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia Dei* and *Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*, both chosen for their relevance to Palamism. He confirms Prochoros' thorough grasp of Latin and capacity for rendering it into good Atticist Greek, underscoring the importance of stylistic considerations in Prochoros' style. Interestingly, Prochoros, like his brother Demetrios, gives priority to rendering the Latin as it stands even in those passages where Thomas quotes Greek sources accessible to the translator.

Marie-Hélène Blanchet, on the other hand, is able to contrast two different translations of the same Thomistic treatise, *De rationibus fidei*, the one by Demetrios Kydones, the other by an otherwise unknown translator named Atoumes, perhaps to be identified with Theodore Atouemes or Simon Atoumanos. Blanchet defends, moreover, the importance of editorial work on the Greek translations of Thomas Aquinas, a task which, it is safe to say, remains low on the list of priorities among most Byzantinists. However, as she points out, editorial work is the necessary preparation for an analysis of how Aquinas entered the Byzantine intellectual universe and for an appraisal of both the borrowing and the rejecting of key Thomistic ideas in this formative period of Orthodox identity. She calls for a different paradigm than that of estrangement and mutual hostility in order to analyze the relationship between the Byzantine-Slavic East and the Latin-dominated West.

John Demetracopoulos has provided us with an in-depth analysis of George Scholarios' homily on almsgiving as a case-study proving Scholarios' heavy dependence on Thomistic sources even when delivering a moralizing discourse; indeed the subtitle runs: "How to convert a scholastic *quaestio* into a sermon". It is a *tour-de-force* that will be indispensable for future research on Scholarios and the *corpus Thomisticum*. At the same time, given that Scholarios does not cite Thomas as a source, his paper provokes questions for a modern reader: Is this an act of plagiarism? Did fear lead Scholarios to conceal his sources?

Similar questions arise in Irini Balcoyiannopoulou's study of Scholarios' logical treatise entitled by Jugie the *Ars vetus*, which she is reediting based on new knowledge of the sources and manuscript tradition. The part Balcoyiannopoulou focuses on is the commentary on Aristotle's *De interpretatione*, but both this and all the other parts represent a patchwork of translations made from Latin sources – Thomas Aquinas, Radulphus Brito, and others. Although Scholarios acknowledges using Latin sources, he does not mention the specific sources by name, and he does claim his work as his own, making frequent use of the heading "Scholarios' exegesis". Is this plagiarism or is it a recycling of sources that pays homage to its origins by hinting at them? It is perhaps our own presuppositions that view Scholarios' methodology as mere plagiarism.

Pantelis Golitsis uses the question of plagiarism as a springboard to a discussion of Scholarios' understanding of Thomas Aquinas' short but seminal work *De ente et essentia*. In his book on the Thomism of Scholarios, Hugh Barbour expressed amazement at Scholarios' pawning off Armandus de Bellovisu's commentary on the *De ente et essentia* as his own. Yet Golitsis shows this to be a misunderstanding on Barbour's part, perhaps due to prejudices against Scholarios and, at any rate, a less than careful reading of the Greek. Linguistic misunderstandings, he argues, are one factor impeding the meeting of East and West. Golitsis proceeds to offer a nuanced case-study of the difficulties in translating the words for being and essence back and forth between Greek and Latin in order to point out deficiencies in our own traditional interpretative and historiographical categories – "Byzantine", "Palamite", "Thomist", etc.

Scholarios figures again in Georgios Steiris' paper on that more eastern East represented by Arabic philosophy. He contrasts the approaches to it in the rival philosophies of Pletho and Scholarios, the rivalry of these two reflecting the perceived rivalry between Platonism and Aristotelianism. Pletho was averse to Arabic philosophy while Scholarios at least appreciated its value. However, the salient point here is that, although the Byzantine world bordered on the Islamic world for centuries, knowledge of Arabic philosophy was primarily a result of Byzantine interaction with Western Scholasticism: the Byzantines of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were not familiar with Arabic philosophy in the original but only with its interpretation in Western Europe. Pletho's critical stance toward Arabic philosophy reflects his hostility to scholasticism; Scholarios' appreciation of it reflects his sympathy for Western scholasticism.

Chris Kappes traces an intricate interplay between Greek East and Latin West in his discussion of Scholarios' understanding of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, an intricacy seen in the very title of his paper with its string of genitives positing relationships between various thinkers. He finds not only reactions to but also a surprising assimilation of the Augustinian conception of original sin already in Gregory Palamas. As he points out, Scholarios could be regarded simply as the culmination of a process of synthesizing Augustinism and Thomism with Orthodox theology; more than a synthesis it was a process of dialogue between Eastern and Western theologians. Despite his Thomistic proclivities, Scholarios shows a keen awareness of the position of Duns Scotus and his followers on the immaculate conception, which readily lent itself to being harmonized with eastern Mariology.

George Scholarios was only one of the prominent Greek delegates at the unionist Council of Florence-Ferrara who makes frequent appearances in these pages. Two others are Mark Eugenikos or Mark of Ephesus and Basilius Bessarion, the former refusing to sign the act of union, the latter going on to become a Roman cardinal. Panagiotis Athanasopoulos offers us a study of how these two clashed over the typically Thomistic "principle of individuation" regarding material substances in the preparation of the Council; this metaphysical issue had a bearing on the Filioque controversy central to the discussions at the Council. Mark addressed the issue in his *Capita syllogistica* and Bessarion replied in his *Refutatio Marci Ephesini*. It will not surprise the reader to find Bessarion drawing on a wide range of texts within the Aristotelian tradition. What is surprising is to see how thoroughly the anti-unionist Mark has absorbed the modes of discourse of western Scholasticism and, even more so, the coincidences of his argumentation with passages in Duns Scotus.

Another great personnage at the Council of Florence was Georgios Gemistos Pletho who, one might say, brought the debate of "Plato versus Aristotle" to the West with the treatise he wrote during the Council, Περὶ ὧν Ἀριστοτέλης πρὸς Πλάτωνα διαφέρεται. Sergei Mariev explores Cardinal Bessarion's contribution to this debate by investigating how Bessarion made use of Aquinas' conception of nature as God's instrument in order to prove the basic accord between Platonism and Christianity. In the face of criticism from that eastern Westerner, George of Trepizond, Bessarion made the Greek East and Latin West converge in the service of Christian Platonism.

I close my survey of the contents of the papers with Tikhon Alexander Pino's study of the extent to which Mark Eugenikos' angelology is indebted to Thomas Aquinas. Pino uses his study of the specific, to modern minds, abstruse question of angelic matter to make important points relevant to the theme of this volume as a whole. For he finds a Byzantine theological milieu in *conversation with* the sources and problems of Latin Scholasticism. As he puts it: "Not only are Greeks and Latins learning *from each other* ... it is clear that they were also to a great extent learning, and philosophizing, together."

Up until now I have said nothing about the title of this book, but I will do so in conclusion. The first line of Kipling's *Ballad of East and West* has often been used to

supply catchy but unimaginative titles for books or conferences about real or supposed dichotomies, and the present volume is no exception. But the poem, though acknowledging a division between Eastern (i. e. Asian) and Western (i. e. European) culture, is really about mutual respect and friendship across cultural divides. Not many people who cite the line “Oh, East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet” know how the poem continues. In fact Kipling’s ballad, an adventure story set at the border between British India and Afghanistan, and rooted in the historical, intercultural context of Queen Victoria’s Own Corps of Guides, immediately proclaims borderless brotherhood within the same refrain:

But there is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth
When two strong men stand face to face, tho' they come from the ends of the earth!

Yet those opening words have become so proverbial as to be used as a mere cliché, a conversation-stopper, a thought-stopper, much like that other phrase “to each his own” (*suum cuique*), which has become similarly detached from its original context. East and West are, of course, relative terms, entirely dependent, geographically speaking, on one’s position between the rising and the setting sun, but also relative when used metaphorically. The papers collected here underscore how the paradigmatic construct of a supposedly Greek East and a supposedly Latin West as well as that of an Eastern and a Western Church obscures the fact that we are dealing with twin phenomena, far more alike than unalike, comparable indeed to the twin lungs of a single organism, to borrow a favorite expression of Pope John Paul II. In a careful and scholarly way these papers prove that the twain has met and still meets.

Franz Tinnefeld

Translations from Latin to Greek

A contribution to late Byzantine intellectual history

Diplomatic, cultural, religious, and economic contacts between Byzantium and the Latin West were never completely interrupted, although, of course, they varied in intensity over time and place. Whereas Western interest in Greek language and literature was constant over time in varying degrees,¹ Byzantines displayed but little interest in the Latin language and literature for several centuries after late antiquity, and their readiness to translate Latin literature into Greek was even less evident.² This situation did not change until the so-called Fourth Crusade (1202–04), when Western powers gained a foothold in Byzantine territory and founded the Latin Empire of Constantinople.³ While this was naturally viewed as a disaster by most Byzantines, it did at any rate strengthen the mutual contacts between East and West.⁴ Against this background, it does not seem so strange that Byzantine intellectuals began to develop an interest in Western culture as well as in outstanding works of Latin literature. The language barrier between East and West still hampered intellectual exchange, however, and created a demand for translations from Latin to Greek.

Fifty years ago, W. O. Schmitt published a study of Latin literature in Byzantium (Schmitt 1967b), and here I shall offer an updated overview of the Greek translations of Latin literature in late Byzantium. For a list of the relevant publications, see the attached bibliography. A glance at it will reveal how knowledge of the subject has expanded since Schmitt's survey, as has the number of available critical editions. All this will be familiar territory to many readers of this book, but this paper is intended as a useful framework for and an introduction to the more specialized discussions of the shared intellectual interests of East and West in the remainder of this volume.

Two phases of translating activity may easily be distinguished, the first being that of the late thirteenth century. In this period, although texts of a popular philosophical and moralizing tendency prevail, other genres were also translated; in the second period philosophical and theological texts of Western scholasticism predominate.

The history of late Byzantine Greek translations from Latin starts right off with a master, of course, the Byzantine intellectual Manuel and later monk Maximos Planudes (ca. 1255–ca. 1305).⁵ Planudes translated classical and post-classical lit-

¹ Berschin 1980; Rochette 1997.

² Gigante 1981a, 65–101.

³ Schmitt 1967b, 127; Kazhdan 1991, vol. 2, 1183–1185.

⁴ Bydén 2004.

⁵ Schmitt 1967b; Fisher 1990.

erature as well as patristic texts. He revealed none of the distrust of his orthodox compatriots towards anything Latin, at least as long as Michael VIII (1259–82), the founder of the Palaiologan dynasty at the expense of the Lascards, ruled Byzantium.⁶ When his general, Alexios Strategopoulos, had reconquered Constantinople from the Latins in 1261, Michael Palaiologos put an end to the Latin Empire of Constantinople but found himself by no means in an easy situation. He coped with the claims of Western rulers on Byzantine territories through clever diplomacy and also by backing papal efforts at ecclesiastical union between East and West. His policy was supported by Planudes whose interest in Latin shows unionist tendencies. At any rate, during the reign of Michael VIII, Planudes translated the *De Trinitate* of Saint Augustine into Greek, that is, the foundational work of Western theology written by the pre-eminent father of the Latin Church.⁷ Of course, in contrast to orthodox theology, Augustine defends there the procession of the Holy Spirit not from God the Father alone but from the Father and the Son (*Filioque*),⁸ which became the main point of controversy between Eastern and Western theology. The issue of the *Filioque* played an important role at the so-called union council of Lyon in 1274 and was more or less forced upon the Byzantine delegates, with some concessions to the orthodox point of view.⁹ Planudes translated the *De Trinitate* very probably when the *Filioque* became an accepted position under the rule of Michael VIII. Later on, during the orthodox reaction under Andronikos II, son and successor of Michael VIII, Planudes wrote two critical treatises on the *Filioque*,¹⁰ in obvious dependence on the ruling power.

As to the reasons for Planudes' other translations we cannot be certain and are left to speculation. There is, first, a group of philosophical or moralizing works that were held in much esteem throughout the Western world. To begin with, we find his translation of *De duodecim abusivis saeculi*, a treatise erroneously ascribed to Cyprian of Carthage (ca. 200–258) but most probably written in the seventh century in Ireland. It belongs among the more popular works of the Latin Middle Ages.¹¹ Basically it is an admonition to lead a Christian life, containing descriptions of morally conflicting character types, for instance, the old man without piety (*senex sine religione*) or the woman without shame (*femina sine pudicitia*). We may assume that in translating this popular work of morality, Planudes simply hoped to convey moral instruction to his own contemporary society.

⁶ On Michael VIII see Geanakoplos 1959, which is still the most detailed work on the emperor and his political activities; see also Kazhdan 1991, vol. 2, 1991, 1367.

⁷ Papathomopoulos, Tsabare, and Rigotti 1995.

⁸ Papathomopoulos, Tsabare, and Rigotti 1995, vol. 2, 974 (Latin), 975 (Greek), with reference to the gospel of John 20:22, where Jesus says: “Λάβετε πνεῦμα ἄγιον.” Augustine quotes this in proof of the procession of the Holy Spirit also from the Son.

⁹ Roberg 1990, 263–267.

¹⁰ Rigotti 1994, 187.

¹¹ Giannakes 1974.

Pseudo-Cyprian was not the only moralizing text translated by Planudes. There was also the so-called *Disticha Catonis*, a collection of short moralizing sentences that in part display a Christian tendency. Distichs (consisting of two hexameters) actually occur only in the second part of the collection. The original work was composed already before the late antique age and had been in general use as a school book since the fourth century. The large number of manuscript copies testifies to the popularity of the Greek translation.¹²

Planudes also translated a classical piece of prose that remained of central importance throughout the Western Middle ages, the so-called *Somnium Scipionis*, part of the sixth and last book of Cicero's *De re publica* of which only fragments remain.¹³ The dream of Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus Minor (185/184–129 B.C.), as reported by Cicero, culminates in the idea that worthy statesmen will be rewarded after their death with eternal bliss in the afterlife. The belief in eternal life for good statesmen, deriving from the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul (Plato, *Phaedrus*, 245c–246a), was doubtless very welcome in a Christian environment, Western as well as Eastern. Planudes' further Greek translation of Macrobius' commentary on the *Somnium* is now available in a critical edition by Megas.¹⁴

The last but not least of the philosophical or moralizing works translated by Planudes to be considered here is *De Consolazione Philosophiae*, the literary masterpiece of Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius (ca. 480–ca. 524), a high official at the court of Theodoric the Great in Ravenna.¹⁵ This is perhaps the best of Planudes' Greek translations and may almost be ranked at the same literary level as the Latin original. This is true not only for the prose passages but even more so for the poetic ones which Boethius interspersed throughout the *Consolatio*.¹⁶ Planudes translates these in the same poetic metres as used in the Latin original.¹⁷ Why did Planudes decide to translate this unique, Late Latin work? Most likely he wanted to make it known to his Greek compatriots, on the one hand, because its philosophical background depends on Aristotelian as well as on Christian philosophy, and, on the other hand, because of the dramatic circumstances of its composition. As is well known, Boethius was in prison when he wrote it, having been accused of high treason, awaiting his execution seeking consolation in philosophy. Jesus Christ is not expressly mentioned in the *Consolatio*, but there is no doubt about the author's Christian orientation in the theology and philosophy of Augustine.¹⁸

¹² Schmitt 1967a; Ortaleva 1992; Papathomopoulos 2009.

¹³ The translation of the Latin text of the *Somnium* into Greek by Planudes is transmitted in numerous manuscripts. A critical edition of the *Somnium* is found in Pavano 1992.

¹⁴ Megas 1995. For the textual criticism of the Greek *Somnium* see Gigante 1981b, 105–130.

¹⁵ Critical edition of the Greek *Consolatio*: Papathomopoulos 1999.

¹⁶ Papathomopoulos 1999, XXXIII–XLII.

¹⁷ Papathomopoulos 1999, LIII.

¹⁸ Papathomopoulos 1999, XXVI–XXVII.

It is striking that Planudes translated not only moralistic and philosophical works from Latin but also classical poetry. Of course, these categories cannot always be clearly distinguished. Thus Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the Roman poet's great hexameter work which Planudes translated into Greek prose,¹⁹ while without doubt a masterpiece of narrative art, does engage in moralizing, for its characters are transformed into animals in punishment for immoral behaviour. Hence Ernst Robert Curtius called the *Metamorphoses* a "Schatzhaus der Moral".²⁰ At the same time, however, the entertainment value of Ovid's work, which, after all, was the main reason for its popularity throughout the ages, would have been motivation enough for Planudes' translation. Compared to contemporary Byzantine literary romances such as, for instance, the romance of Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe, the *Metamorphoses* displays far more outstanding literary qualities and sheer inventiveness, while at the same time offering readers a number of erotic episodes.²¹

Who supplied Planudes with Latin manuscripts? We do not know, but we can assume that some of them were carried in the luggage of Westerners traveling to Byzantium. However, we also know that Planudes went to Venice in 1296 as an ambassador of Emperor Andronikos II. This was very likely an opportunity for him to bring Latin books back to Constantinople. Moreover, we also know that Dominican monasteries in the East sometimes transmitted knowledge of Western literature to Byzantium.²²

Planudes was not the only Byzantine intellectual of his time to translate Latin literature. The philologist and poet Manuel Holobolos (born ca. 1240 and living at least until after 1284) was probably also a translator, since at least two translations of logical treatises of Boethius are ascribed to him: *De hypotheticis syllogismis* and *De topicis differentiis* (= *De dialectica*). The latter treatise is an excellent introduction to the Aristotelian topics, an indispensable element in Aristotelian logic.²³ It was in fact translated twice later on in the 14th century, first by Georgios Pachymeres (1242–ca. 1310) from a shorter Latin original, and, later again, by Prochoros Kydones (ca. 1335–ca. 1370).

An anonymous contemporary of Planudes translated sentences (ἐπιγραφαὶ) of mainly moral content from the fourth and fifth books of the *Speculum doctrinale*, one of the three parts of the *Opusculum maius*, an encyclopedia written by the Dominican Vincent of Beauvais (ca. 1184/94–ca. 1264). It was probably Guillaume Bernard de

¹⁹ Edition: Papathomopoulos and Tsabare 2002. On Planudes' translation see Fisher 1990, 69–98.

²⁰ See Schmitt 1967b, 139.

²¹ Other texts written by Ovid and translated into Greek that have mainly an erotical character are: the *Heroides* (love letters written by mythical women to mythical women), the *Ars amatoria*, the *Amores* and the *Remedia amoris*. With the exception of the *Heroides* these are only transmitted in fragments, and it is not certain that these were translated by Planudes.

²² Cf. what is said below on Guillaume de Guillac and the anonymous teacher of Demetrios Kydones, both Dominicans; see also n. 24.

²³ Niketas 1984.

Guillac, the founder of a monastery of Dominicans near Constantinople in Pera who introduced the *Speculum* to Constantinople.²⁴ On ff. 225v–228r cod. Vaticanus gr. 1144 contains a collection of sentences under the title “Ἐκ τοῦ ἄκτορος²⁵ λατινικοῦ βιβλίου” which, according to Sternbach 1900/01, go back to books IV and V of the *Speculum*. This discovery remained unnoticed until in 1986 W. J. Aerts published a very careful edition of the text in that same manuscript. In 1997 Inmaculada Pérez Martín was able to supplement this with the edition of a similar text from cod. Vaticanus gr. 12, ff. 187r–193r.²⁶ According to Pérez Martín it is probable that the anonymous translator of the sentences in the book of the “actor” was the Byzantine monk Sophonias²⁷ who had a good command of Latin, especially after he had travelled as an envoy of Emperor Andronikos II to the court of Charles II of Anjou at Naples, where he stayed from 1294 to 1296, converting there to the Roman Church.

We come now to the second phase of Greek translations from Latin in the second half of the fourteenth century, which primarily concerns translations of works by Thomas Aquinas as well as other theological works emanating from the same milieu. The leading persons of this phase were two brothers from Thessalonike, the statesman and humanist Demetrios Kydones and the monk Prochoros Kydones.²⁸ Demetrios was born ca. 1324, almost twenty years after Planudes’ demise; Prochoros was about ten years younger. Demetrios entered civil service around 1347 under Emperor John VI Kantakuzenos; his brother became a monk in the monastery Megiste Laura on Mount Athos. In one of his autobiographical treatises, Demetrios tells us that he had from the start only practical intentions in learning Latin. Due to his ministerial post, he had to negotiate with Western ambassadors and merchants, and he desired personal contact with them without having to resort to the mediation of often unreliable interpreters. In search of a teacher of Latin he turned to the monastery of the Dominicans in Pera.²⁹ There he made friends with one of the monks who was also well versed in the writings of his fellow Dominican Thomas Aquinas (1224/5–1274). It was through the efforts of this monk that Demetrios was not only introduced to Latin but also to Thomas’ theology and philosophical methodology. After his initial progress in both the Latin language and Thomistic theology, Kydones received a very demanding exercise book from his teacher, namely, Aquinas’ *Summa contra Gentiles*, which, of course, is a philosophical and theological defense of Roman Catholic belief with respect not only to paganism but also to Islam (especially Averroism), Judaism and certain Christian heresies. The fourth and last book deals with the controversial doctrines of Byzant-

²⁴ Pérez Martín 1997a, 81–82.

²⁵ “Actor”, i. e. “auctor”, refers to the author of the collected sentences.

²⁶ Pérez Martín 1997a, 102–132.

²⁷ On Sophonias see Pérez Martín 1997a, 100–101; Failler 2002; Bydén 2004, 137–142; Searby 2016.

²⁸ For historical details of Demetrios Kydones’ life see Tinnefeld 1981, 4–52. For Prochoros see Tinnefeld 1981, 237–244. For their theological background: Plested 2012d, 63–84.

²⁹ Cf. n. 22 and 24 as well their corresponding texts.

tine Orthodoxy. As he studied the work, Demetrios became increasingly enthusiastic about the author's clear style and rigorous method as well as about his knowledge of Aristotelian philosophy. Eventually Demetrios continued not only to read but also began to translate the book. His efforts at translating, as Kydones tells his readers, attracted the favour of Emperor John VI.³⁰ In an autograph manuscript of the Greek translation of *SG* we find a note stating that Kydones completed his translation on 24 December 1354, shortly after the abdication of Emperor John VI.

Already in the following year, Kydones began to translate Aquinas' even more voluminous *Summa theologiae*, and gradually managed to complete Book One (*pars prima*) and Two (*pars prima secundae partis* and *pars secunda secundae partis*). Here he found material in order to defend his developing theological positions against accepted orthodox doctrine and in agreement with the Roman doctrine on the Holy Trinity and on the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, but also as regards the doctrine of the divine energies developed by Gregorios Palamas. The result was that Kydones approached ever closer the Roman Catholic position on these fundamental issues, until, probably in 1357, he joined the Roman Church.

Kydones also translated several other theological texts. In my own translation of Kydones' letters, I offer a list of all his translations including those not related to Aquinas; almost all his translations were of theological works.³¹ In this paper I confine myself to a few of his more noteworthy translations, beginning with that of a mystical treatise erroneously ascribed to Augustine (354–430) but really written at some time after 1215, the so-called *Monologia sive Soliloquia* ("Soliloquiorum animae ad Deum" in *Patrologia Latina* 40, 863–898). Its Greek version has recently attracted scholarly attention thanks to the critical edition by Anna Koltsiou in 2005, over two hundred years after the (non-critical) *editio princeps* by Nikodemos Hagiorites in 1799.

John Demetracopoulos has published a lengthy study of Koltsiou's edition along with a detailed examination of the dating of the Greek translation of the *Soliloquia*.³² Prior to Koltsiou, the common scholarly opinion on its dating was 1371/74, which was the date proposed by Loenertz for letter no. 25 in his edition of Kydones' correspondence.³³ In this letter, Kydones comments on the delivery of a copy of his *Soliloquia* translation to Empress Helena Palaiologina, wife of emperor John V Palaiologos and patroness of Kydones. I accepted this dating in my commentary to letter no. 25 (= no. 92 of my German translation),³⁴ but Koltsiou rejected it, being, to my knowledge, the first scholar to propose a much later date for the translation. In her opinion, Kydones translated this work because he was seeking consolation in expectation of his

³⁰ Plested 2012d, 84–89.

³¹ Tinnefeld 1981, 68–72.

³² J. A. Demetracopoulos 2006d, 191–258.

³³ Loenertz 1956–1960, 54–55.

³⁴ Tinnefeld 1982, 497–499.

approaching death.³⁵ Against this dating J. A. Demetracopoulos 2006d defended the traditional opinion, arguing that Kydones' decision to translate the *Soliloquia* can also be explained as seeking consolation for the far too early death of his brother Prochoros during Demetrios' stay in Italy 1370/71. Certainly, Demetracopoulos' "Sitz im Tode" argument, as he calls it, provides a cogent reason for the traditional dating of the translation.

Kydones' commitment to scholasticism is also evident from his translation of the anti-Islamic treatise *Contra legem Sarracenororum* by the Florentine Dominican and scholastic Riccoldo da Monte Croce (1243–1320).³⁶ This translation was the main source of the anti-Islamic treatise of Emperor John VI Kantakuzenos.³⁷ It is worth mentioning that Kydones clearly stated in some of his letters that he was a determined adversary of the Islamic Turks also for political reasons. I refer especially to his correspondence with his student and friend Rhadenos whom he implores in numerous letters to leave his place of residence in Thessalonike because it is in danger of being conquered by the Turks. He warns him not to surrender to the "ungodly" (ἀσεβεῖς) Muslims and thus lose his liberty and endanger his soul.³⁸

Finally, also attributed to Kydones on hardly questionable grounds is the only complete Greek translation of the *Constitutum Constantini* or *Donation of Constantine*, the well-known forgery ceding the Western part of the Roman Empire to the papacy. With this translation Kydones was obviously trying to demonstrate to his Byzantine fellow citizens that the first "Byzantine" emperor, Constantine the Great, was a so-called λατινόφρων, a friend of the Latin part of the Roman Empire.

Although Prochoros (ca. 1333/34–1369/70), the younger brother of Demetrios, was not as productive a translator, his work deserves acknowledgement. While still a young monk on Mount Athos, he acquired not only a splendid knowledge of Latin, but also, partly under the influence of his brother, a solid understanding of scholastic methodology. During his brief life he composed not only several translations of Latin writings but also some works of his own under scholastic influence. No less a scholar than Giovanni Mercati praised his "informazione, singolare per un bizantino, nella lingua Latina e nella teologia occidentale."³⁹ In the introduction to his edition of Prochoros' translation of eight letters of Augustine, Herbert Hunger considered the reasons for Prochoros' choice. For six of the eight letters the choice was probably determined by their placement at the head of a widespread medieval collection of Augustine's letters. The remaining two letters deal with the vision of God, a theme

³⁵ According to Ganchou 2002, 479, Demetrios Kydones died certainly in 1397, and not in 1398, a year long accepted as a possible alternative date of his death.

³⁶ For Riccoldo, his biography and work see Todt 1991, 231–282.

³⁷ For Kantakuzenos' use of Riccoldo's work for his Ἀπολογίαι καὶ λόγοι κατὰ τοῦ Μωάμεθ, see Todt 1991, 392–566, who only uses a German version of the title (*Apologien und Reden gegen Muhammad*).

³⁸ Tinnefeld 1985, 234–236.

³⁹ Mercati 1931e, 39.

relevant to the debate on Palamism,⁴⁰ which, of course, has to do with the beholding of God through the so-called energies, a doctrine rejected by its initial opponents as approaching polytheism.⁴¹

Both Prochoros' translation of these letters and his translation of Augustine's dialogue *De libero arbitrio* (*Περὶ τῆς αὐτεξουσιότητος*)⁴² are transmitted in autograph manuscripts.⁴³ The text of the latter translation ends for no clear reason⁴⁴ in Book I, chapter 90. As already noted,⁴⁵ Prochoros also made a third Greek translation of Boethius' *De topicis differentiis*, no doubt because of his conviction that theological knowledge was not possible without logical thinking. Prochoros also continued the work of his brother Demetrios in translating a large part (at least 76 articles) of *ST III^a* as well as six articles of the supplement and, in addition, the opuscule *De aeternitate mundi*.⁴⁶ Prochoros wrote his own chief work (edited only in part) *Περὶ οὐσίας καὶ ἐνέργειας* (= *De essentia et operatione*) surely with a view to Aquinas' *De ente et essentia*.

Manuel Kalekas, a disciple and friend of Demetrios Kydones, converted to Roman Catholicism in 1396, becoming a Dominican around 1404 in a Latin monastery on the island Lesbos, where he died in 1410. Under the influence of Kydones he studied Aquinas and translated works of Western theology into Greek, such as the *De Trinitate* of Boethius.⁴⁷ Ever since Mercati 1931e, 90, a Greek translation of the *Cur Deus homo* of Anselm of Canterbury (1033/34–1109) has been ascribed to Kalekas, although the main reason for this assumption was that the manuscript containing the translation (Vaticanus gr. 614, 84–109) was written in Kalekas' hand. Recently, however, Demetracopoulos⁴⁸ has rejected this attribution, arguing that Kydones, the translator of other works of Anselm, could very well have dictated the translation of this work to his disciple Kalekas.⁴⁹

Last in this line of translators deserving mention is Georgios Gennadios Scholarios, the first orthodox patriarch of Constantinople after the city's conquest by the Turks in 1453. From his hand we have not only Greek translations, but also abridged versions (epitomai) of Latin works. Among the titles attributed to him⁵⁰ three Thomistic works may be mentioned here: 1) *Περὶ διαφορᾶς οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ εἶναι*, a translation

40 Hunger 1984b, 13–14.

41 See Tinnefeld 1982, 397, n. 11; Tinnefeld 2007, 12.

42 Hunger 1990a, 12–53.

43 Hunger 1984b, 10–11; Hunger 1990a, 7.

44 On Prochoros' reasons for leaving the dialogue unfinished, see Hunger 1990a, 72–73.

45 See above, n. 21, n. 22 and the corresponding text.

46 Beck 1959, 737–738; Glycofridou-Leontsini 1975, 429–432.

47 J. A. Demetracopoulos 2005, 83–118.

48 J. A. Demetracopoulos 1995–1996, 113–117.

49 See Tinnefeld 1981, 70 (Anselm 2.7.1: *De processione Spiritus Sancti*; 2.7.2: *De azymo et fermentato epistula*).

50 See the survey of titles in Tinnefeld 2002, 517–520.

of Aquinas, *DEE* (along with a commentary translated by Scholarios); 2) Ἐπιτομὴ τοῦ βιβλίου κατὰ ἑθνικῶν, an epitome of Demetrios Kydones' translation of the *SG*; 3) Ἐπιτομὴ τοῦ πρώτου βιβλίου τῶν θεολογικῶν, an epitome of Kydones' translation of *ST Ia*.

To sum up: Whereas the number of Byzantine translators from Latin is, as we have seen, quite small, the number and especially the volume of their translations is substantial. However, it is not so much the existence of the translations itself that matters but their role in Byzantine intellectual history. The importance of their reception may to some extent be measured by the number of extant manuscript copies but to a much greater extent by the documented reaction of the readers. As described, for instance, by Gerhard Podskalsky, scholasticism entered the Orthodox world through the translations of Aquinas.⁵¹ In the whole context of Byzantine aloofness and distrust towards the Latin West after 1204, it is all the more remarkable that Byzantines like Planudes and the Kydones brothers sought and acquired such an impressive expertise in the Latin language and in Western thought and literature. On the one hand we find an opening up of new contacts between East and West, on the other a shutting down of the contacts between them, especially amid the distrust and hostility under the rule of Andronikos II.⁵² The effects of the Fourth Crusade were truly contradictory.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abbreviations

cod. gr.	codex graecus
DEE	De ente et essentia
ed.	edidit, ediderunt
et al.	and others
f.	folio
ff.	folios
n.	note
no.	number
SG	Summa contra gentiles
ST	Summa theologiae
tr.	translation
vol.	volume

⁵¹ Podskalsky 1977a, 173–239.

⁵² As shown in the splendid monography of Laiou 1972.

Primary Sources

“Proverbial passages taken from Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum doctrinale*, translated into Medieval Greek” (1986). In: *Medievalia Groningiana* 7. Ed. by W. J. Aerts, pp. 141–187.

“Manuel Calecas' translation of Boethius' *De Trinitate. Introduction*, new critical edition, index *graecolatinitatis*” (2005). In: *Synthesis Philosophica* 39. Ed. by J. A. Demetracopoulos, pp. 83–118.

Demetrios Kydones, Briefe, übersetzt und erläutert (1981–2003). Trans. by F. Tinnefeld. Vol. I/1: 1981; I/2: 1982; II: 1991; III: 1999; IV: 2003. Stuttgart.

Ganchou, T. (2002). “Démétrios Kydônès, Les frères Chrysobergès et la Crète (1397–1407) de nouveaux documents”. In: *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco*. Ed. by C. A. Maltesou and P. Schreiner. Venezia, pp. 435–493.

“Μαξίμου Πλανούδη μετάφραση τοῦ περὶ τῶν δώδεκα βαθμῶν τῆς παραχρήσεως τοῦ Ψευδο-Αύγουστινου” (1974). In: *Δωδόνη* 3. Ed. by G. N. Giannakes, pp. 217–258.

Hunger, H., ed. (1984b). *Prochoros Kydones, Übersetzung von acht Briefen des Hl. Augustinus*. Wien.

Hunger, H., ed. (1990a). *Prochoros Kydones' Übersetzungen von S. Augustinus, De libero arbitrio I–90 und Ps. Augustinus, De decem plagis Aegyptiorum (lateinisch-griechisch)*. Wien.

Koltsiou-Niketa, A. K., ed. (2005). *Μετάφραση του ψευδοαυγουστινείου Soliloquia (Τί αν είποι ψυχή μόνη προς μόνον τὸν θεόν)*. Athenai.

Loenertz, R.-J., ed. (1956–1960). *Démétrius (=Démètrius) Cydonès, Correspondance*. 2 vols. Città del Vaticano.

Megas, A. C., ed. (1995). *Μαξίμου Πλανούδη (1255–1305) τοῦ ὑπομνήματος εἰς τὸ Ὄνειρον τοῦ Σκιπίωνος τοῦ Μακροβίου μετάφραση*. Thessalonike.

Mercati, G., ed. (1931e). *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Kaleka, Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV*. Città del Vaticano.

Nikephoros Gregoras, *Rhomäische Geschichte* (2007). Trans. by F. Tinnefeld. Vol. 6.

“Η βυζαντινή μετάφραση του έργου του Βοηθίου *De differentiis topicis* από τον Πρόχορο Κυδώνη” (1984). In: *Ελληνικά* 35. Ed. by D. Niketas, pp. 275–315.

Ortleva, V., ed. (1992). *Maximus Planudes. Disticha Catonis in Graecum translata*. Roma.

Papathomopoulos, M., ed. (1999). *Ἀννιτίου Μαλλίου Σεβηρίνου Βοηθοῦ βιβλος Περὶ παραμυθίας τῆς φιλοσοφίας, ἣν μετήνεγκεν εἰς τὴν ἑλλάδα διάλεκτον Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης*. Copy of the Latin text and, in parallel position, critical edition of the Greek translation. Athenai.

Papathomopoulos, M., ed. (2009). *Κάτωνος γνῶμαι παραινετικαὶ δίστιχοι ἃς μετήνεγκεν ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων φωνῆς εἰς τὴν ἑλλάδα διάλεκτον Μάξιμος μοναχὸς ὁ Πλανούδης*. Copy of the Latin text and, in parallel position, critical edition of the Greek text. Athenai.

Papathomopoulos, M. and I. Tsabare, eds. (2002). *Οβιδίου περὶ μεταμορφώσεων ὃ μετήνεγκεν ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων φωνῆς εἰς τὴν ἑλλάδα Μάξιμος μοναχὸς ὁ Πλανούδης*. Copy of the Latin text and, in parallel position, critical edition of the Greek text in prose. Athenai.

Papathomopoulos, M., I. Tsabare, and G. Rigotti, eds. (1995). *Αύγουστίνου Περὶ Τριάδος βιβλία πεντεκαίδεκα, ἅπερ ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν ἑλλάδα μετήνεγκες Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης. Εἰσαγωγή, ἑλληνικὸ καὶ λατινικὸ κείμενο, γλωσσάριο*. Copy of the Latin text and, in parallel position, critical edition of the Greek text. Athenai.

Pavano, A., ed. (1992). *Maximus Planudes, M. Tullii Ciceronis Somnium Scipionis in Graecum translatum*. Roma.

“El libro de actor. Una traducción bizantina del *Speculum doctrinale* de Beauvais (Vat. gr. 12 y 1144)” (1997a). In: *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 55. Ed. by I. Pérez Martín, pp. 81–136.

Secondary Sources

Beck, H. G. (1959). *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*. München.

Berschin, W. (1980). *Griechisch-lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern.

Bydén, B. (2004). “‘Strangle them with these meshes of syllogisms!’ Latin philosophy in Greek translations of the thirteenth century”. In: *Interaction and isolation in late Byzantine culture*. Ed. by J. O. Rosenqvist. Uppsala, pp. 133–165.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (1995-1996). “A critical note on the text of St. Anselm's *Cur Deus homo* 1, 21”. In: *Byzantina* 18, pp. 113–117.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2006d). “The *Sitz im Leben* of Demetrios Cydones' translation of Pseudo-Augustine's Soliloquia. Remarks on a recent edition”. In: *Quaestio* 6, pp. 191–258.

Failler, A. (2002). “La mission du moine Sophonias en Italie et le mariage de Michel IX Palaiologos”. In: *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 60, pp. 151–166.

Fisher, E. (1990). *Planudes' Greek translation of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. New York and London.

Geanakoplos, D. (1959). *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258–1282*. Cambridge.

Gigante, M. (1981a). “Il latino a Bisanzio”. In: *Scritti sulla civiltà letteraria bizantina*. Napoli, pp. 65–101.

Gigante, M. (1981b). “Massimo Planude interprete di Cicerone”. In: *Scritti sulla civiltà letteraria bizantina*. Napoli, pp. 105–130.

Glycofridou-Leontsini, A. (1975). “La traduzione in Greco delle opere di Tommaso d'Aquino”. In: *Nicolaus* 3.2, pp. 429–432.

Kazhdan, A. P., ed. (1991). *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*. 3 vols.

Laiou, A. E. (1972). *Constantinople and the Latins. The foreign policy of Andronicus II 1282–1328*. Cambridge/Mass.

Plested, M. (2012d). *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*. Oxford.

Podskalsky, G. (1977a). *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz*. München.

Rigotti, G. (1994). “Massimo Planude traduttore del De Trinitate di S. Agostino”. In: *La traduzione di testi religiosi*. Ed. by C. Moreschini and G. G. Menestrina. Brescia, pp. 185–196.

Roberg, B. (1990). *Das zweite Konzil von Lyon [1274]*. Paderborn.

Rochette, B. (1997). *Le latin dans le monde grec. Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'empire romain*. Bruxelles.

Schmitt, W. O. (1967a). “Cato in Byzanz”. In: *Klio* 48, pp. 325–334.

Schmitt, W. O. (1967b). “Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz. Die Übersetzungen des Maximos Planudes und die moderne Forschung”. In: *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 16, pp. 127–147.

Searby, D. (2016). “Sophonias”. In: *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*. Ed. by R. Goulet. Vol. 6. Paris, pp. 473–477.

Sternbach, L. (1900/1901). “De Vincentii Bellovacensis excerptis graecis”. In: *České Museum Filologické* 6/7, pp. 401–416, 1–28.

Tinnefeld, F. (1985). “Freundschaft und Παιδεία. Die Korrespondenz des Demetrios Kydones mit Rhadenos (1375–1387/8)”. In: *Byzantion* 55, pp. 210–244.

Tinnefeld, F. (2002b). “Georgios Gennadios Scholarios”. In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*. Ed. by C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello. Turnhout, pp. 477–549.

Todt, K.-P. (1991). *Kaiser Johannes VI. Kantakuzenos und der Islam. Politische Realität und theologische Polemik im palaiologenzeitlichen Byzanz*. Würzburg.

Marcus Plested

Reconfiguring East and West in Byzantine and Modern Orthodox Theology

The overarching theme of this volume touches upon a question that has been at the heart of my own research and teaching agenda for the last fifteen years or more – the conception of “East” and “West” in theology and Church history. Many if not all readers of this volume, even the younger ones, will have been brought up on the notion that “East” and “West” are clearly delineated theological and ecclesial categories. We all know (or think we know) what we mean when we speak of Eastern or Western Christianity. Writing this at my desk in Milwaukee I see on my bookshelves volume after volume perpetuating, at least implicitly, the idea of East and West as meaningful and self-evident theological and ecclesial categories: Vladimir Lossky’s *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*; Philip Sherrard’s *Greek East and Latin West* (and Andrew Louth’s book of the same name); Deno Geanakoplos’ *Byzantine East and Latin West*, Christos Yannaras’ *Orthodoxy and the West*; Jaroslav Pelikan’s *Spirit of Eastern Christendom*: the Pelikan Festschrift *Orthodoxy and Western Culture*; Nicholas Zernov’s *Eastern Christendom*; Adrian Fortescue’s *The Orthodox Eastern Church* – the list stretches on. A random selection of course but not, I think an atypical one. And without suggesting that all these works are equally blithe or unsubtle in the assumptions they make about East and West they give an idea of the sheer normality of the East-West dichotomy in the modern theological arena.

Not that this is an entirely bad thing. Before the vast upheavals and population movements of the twentieth century, the life and theology of the Orthodox Churches was a matter of supreme indifference to much of the Catholic and Protestant world. This has changed – Orthodox theology has gained some limited purchase and respect in many of the theological arenas of Western Europe and North America. But this has come at a cost, most notably in terms of a dialectical construct of Orthodox (i. e. Eastern) identity vis-à-vis a Western other (whether the Catholic/Protestant West or, more recently, the liberal secular West). Such dialectical constructions of identity drastically homogenise both East and West and greatly over-simplify the relations obtaining between them.

But first a brief word on the much-maligned poet Rudyard Kipling who was well aware that his comment on the otherness and separation of East and West was something of a sweeping statement, warning his literary epigones (if they wished to avoid sackfuls of post) to avoid such “glittering generalisations”:

Long ago I stated that “East was East and West was West and never the twain should meet”. It seemed right, for I had checked it by the card, but I was careful to point out circumstances under which cardinal points ceased to exist. Forty years rolled on, and for a fair half of them the

excellent and uplifted of all lands would write me, apropos of each new piece of broad-minded folly in India, Egypt, or Ceylon, that East and West had met—as, in their muddled minds, I suppose they had. Being a political Calvinist, I could not argue with these condemned ones. But their letters had to be opened and filed.¹

Kipling's “glittering generalisation” has frequently been used to speak of the theological divide between East and West in recent decades – I myself used it (with a question mark) in an article on grace in Macarius and Augustine back in 2004.² It seems to me that as far as Kipling is concerned East and West do indeed remain poles apart for all the exceptional instances of bridging – such as the “two strong men” of the poem “The Ballad of East and West”. But Kipling of course had little notion of Byzantium or Eastern Orthodoxy – his East was pre-eminently the Raj, that is, British India. This is a salutary reminder that one man's East is by no means necessarily another's.

East and West are of course in the first instance geographical denominators, denoting the direction in which the sun rises and sets – of course this comes over rather better in Greek – ἀνατολὴ καὶ δύσις. The areas we denote in common parlance as East and West correspond to the sun's setting and rising from a European and more specifically a Roman perspective. Indeed much of what we understand (theologically speaking) by “East” and “West” dovetails rather neatly with Diocletian's division of the Empire in 284 AD. But while that division corresponded in some measure to cultural and linguistic divisions (especially between Latin and Greek intellectual cultures), it had no impact on the overall unity of the patristic theological enterprise. The emergence of a distinctly Latin theological culture in Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, and others no more created two rival theological traditions than did the emergence of the distinct theological culture of the Syriac-speaking orient – Aphrahat, Ephrem, Jacob of Serrugh, and others. Indeed one of the most helpful developments in recent scholarship on the Trinitarian debates of the fourth century onwards has been to review misleading presuppositions as to the distinctness of the theological trajectories of East and West at this time – and here I think especially of the work of Lewis Ayres and my colleague Michel Barnes. Barnes' work on the pervasiveness of the de Regnon paradigm – contrasting West and East as particularly alive to divine threeness and divine oneness, respectively, is perhaps especially pertinent.³ Even within the long process of inter-Christian estrangement we call the East-West schism, signs of any perceived fundamental opposition between Greek and Latin theological traditions are few and far between. For example, the Frankish attempts to demonstrate the “kakodoxy” of the Empire of the Greeks as a way of burnishing the theological credentials of their “new and improved” Holy Roman Empire make a serious effort to appropriate the Greek theological tradition to their advantage – witness for example the *Decretum*

¹ Kipling 1991, 128.

² Plested 2004.

³ See Barnes 1995a and Barnes 1995b.

Aquisgranense issued by the Council of Aachen in 809. Even Photius with his spirited resistance to Frankish missionary expansionism can scarcely credit the idea that there might be any fundamental incompatibility between Latin and Greek accounts of the Trinity. Skipping over the unfortunate but limited exchange of anathemas in 1054, a disreputable event scarcely noticed at the time, we come to 1204 and the Latin occupation of Constantinople (1204–61). This shameful episode did little to endear the Latins to the Byzantines – as, still less, did the vexatious commercial stranglehold gained by Latin powers in the Palaiologan period. As Barlaam of Calabria famously put it in 1339: “That which separates the Greeks from you is not so much a difference in dogma as the hatred of the Greeks for the Latins provoked by the wrongs they have suffered”.⁴ Throughout the various theological debates and developments of the Palaiologan era this estimation held true – precious few were the voices prepared to affirm a fundamental incompatibility between the theological traditions of the Latin West and Greek East. On the contrary, a presupposition of harmony and compatibility remained the mainstream view even among avowed Palamites and ardent anti-unionists – sections of the Byzantine theological spectrum we might expect to have adopted a thorough-going anti-Western platform. But why should we expect Palamites and anti-unionists (or indeed anyone in Byzantium) to be instinctively anti-Western? Why should we assume the twain were never going to meet? To answer this we need to look at some of the theological developments of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁵

It seems to me that the first signs of instinctive anti-Westernism within Orthodox theology are to be found within the Russian Slavophile movement. Emerging as a counter to the policy of Westernisation favoured by Peter the Great and his successors, the Slavophiles posited a fundamental dichotomy between the Greco-Slavic East and the Latin West, whether Catholic or Protestant. Nurtured (ironically) by German Idealism and Romanticism, the Slavophiles looked back rather to Russia’s past for the tools with which to resist creeping Westernization, one prominent sign of which was the dominance of the scholastic tradition in the theological schools of the Russian Empire. Ivan Kireevsky (1806–1856), denounces western scholasticism in these terms:

This endless, tiresome juggling of concepts over seven hundred years, this useless kaleidoscope of abstract categories spinning unceasingly before the mind’s eye, was bound in the end to blind it to those living convictions that lie above the sphere of rationalistic understanding and logic – convictions to which people do not attain through syllogisms, but whose truth, on the contrary, people can only distort, if not utterly destroy, through syllogistic deduction.

What Kireevsky proposes instead is a theology based on the collective wisdom of the Slav peoples and nourished by a retrieval of the patristic and ascetic inheritance of

⁴ Barlaam, *Orat.* PG 151, 1336B (the passage is translated in Geanakoplos 1966, 91).

⁵ This and subsequent sections reprise in condensed and adapted form material presented in Plested 2012b.

the Church. Similar sentiments abound in Alexei Khomiakov (1804–1860) who singles out excessive rationalism as a defect common to all Western confessions, whether supplemented by papal authoritarianism or Protestant individualism – Protestantism and Catholicism being simply two sides of the same coin. To counter this Khomiakov proposes an ecclesiology founded on the innately conciliar nature of the Slav peoples with their instinct for love, unity, and freedom. This model of unity-in-freedom is held up as an antidote to the excessive rationalism of the West of which Thomas Aquinas is a prime example.

All of this anti-Westernism is deeply shaped by dialogue with Western sources including Schlegel, Schelling, Möhler, Hegel, and Fichte. More to the point, it is also something rather new: a dialectical or oppositional construct of Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy is defined by the Slavophiles as non-Western, non-rationalistic, non-authoritarian, non-individualistic – in other words not by what it *is* but by what it *is not*. Romantic appeals to a mythical past cannot hide the fact that this is a conception of Orthodoxy governed and conditioned by that which it proposes to reject. Having presented rationalistic scholasticism as the defining feature of Western theology (and of course of the Western-leaning theology of the Russian Theological Academies), the only truly Orthodox theology, for the Slavophiles, is one that is anti-scholastic and anti-rational – and so anti-Thomist. Fuming against the Latinate scholasticism of establishment Russian theology, the Slavophiles conjure a phantom of Orthodox theology in which the traditional rational and, yes, scholastic dimension is missing.

The Slavophiles had little immediate impact and indeed were roundly ignored by the Russian theological and ecclesiastical establishment.⁶ Nor did they have any immediate impact on the Greek thought-world. They were also much despised by that mesmerising genius Vladimir Soloviev (1853–1900) who decried their dialectical Orthodoxy, attacking those “who suppose the orthodoxy or religion of the Greco-Russian Church in opposition to the Western communions to be the very essence of our national identity”.⁷ But the Slavophiles did bequeath a significant legacy, most notably to the theology of the Russian diaspora following on from the Bolshevik Revolution. Here the dominant figure is Sergius Bulgakov (1871–1944), Orthodoxy’s most constructive theologian of the twentieth century. Bulgakov articulated, or attempted to articulate an extraordinary and all-encompassing vision of the world in God and God in the world, a vision in which Sophia (Wisdom) is the link-piece of a vast theological synthesis uniting Trinitarian theology, Christology, pneumatology, cosmology, ecclesiology, Mariology – not to mention economics, politics, and culture. Thomas Aquinas emerges as something of a bogeyman for Bulgakov. In his essay on “The Eucharistic Dogma”, Bulgakov presents Aquinas to be the archetypal exponent of Western eucharistic theology, assent to whose teachings is incumbent upon all Roman Catholics.

⁶ See Shezov 2012.

⁷ Soloviev 1889, 14–15.

Protestant teachings on the eucharist conversely represent little more than dissent to this doctrine. “In other words, the whole of Western eucharistic theology is a positive or negative Thomism.” And this is not simply a matter affecting the non-Orthodox: “The influence of Aquinas’ doctrine also spread to the East; recent Orthodox theology concerning this question is still under the indirect and insufficiently understood influence of Thomism, an influence that must be completely overcome”.

Bulgakov concludes that Aquinas’ teaching in the matter of the high mystery of the eucharist represent the abject enslavement of theology to philosophy – and to a very particular and outmoded philosophy at that. Even in purely philosophical terms, transubstantiation is “an outright coercion of reason, a completely unnecessary and unjustified archaism”. He does not think that Orthodoxy has yet “said its word” on the matter. To do so it needs to “return to the theology of the Fathers (one thousand years into the past), to the patristic doctrine, and to use it as a true guide, to unfold it creatively and apply it to our time [...] By relying on the patristic doctrine, we can exit the scholastic labyrinth and go out into the open air, although an exertion of thought will be necessary to assimilate the patristic doctrine. Such, in general, is the path of Church tradition: it is always not only conservative but also creative.” In all this, Thomas Aquinas stands as representative of a rationalistic and impersonal Western theology diametrically opposed to Orthodoxy. In so far as he has infiltrated the theology of the Christian East, Thomas represents an “influence that must be completely overcome” through a creative retrieval of the Fathers.

Vladimir Lossky (1903–58) adopts an uncannily similar approach despite being an implacable opponent of Bulgakov’s sophiology. Although intimately acquainted with some of most exciting developments of the Thomist revival of the early twentieth century (not least as a student of Étienne Gilson), Lossky betrays little sympathy for Aquinas. For Lossky, it is not so much the doctrine of transubstantiation but that of the *filioque* that most aptly encapsulates the rationalist excesses of Western theology. Originating in Augustine and reaching some sort of crescendo moment in Aquinas, the doctrine of the *filioque* is decried as an unwarranted intrusion into the mystery of the Trinity and a direct progenitor of modern secularism. In his chef d’oeuvre, *Essai sur la théologie mystique de l’Église d’Orient*, Lossky contrasts the mystical and experiential character of Orthodox theology with the rationalism of Latin theology typified by Aquinas.⁸ Thomas is presented as an incorrigible rationalist even when appropriating Dionysius. Unlike Palamas, who fully grasps the radical character of Dionysius’ apophaticism, Aquinas is accused of reducing apophatic theology to simple negation.⁹ All this brings Lossky to the depressing conclusion that between the cataphatic and rationalizing approach of the West (represented by Augustine and Aquinas) and

⁸ See, for example, Lossky 1944, 24, 56, 90 [ET 26, 57, 95].

⁹ Lossky 1974e, 53. Cf. also Lossky 1974a, 26.

the apophatic and mystical approach of the East (represented by the Cappadocian Fathers, Dionysius, and Palamas) there is really nothing in common:

The difference between the two conceptions of the Trinity determines, on both sides, the whole character of theological thought. This is so to such an extent that it becomes difficult to apply, without equivocation, the same name of theology to these two different ways of dealing with divine realities.¹⁰

As in Bulgakov, only a creative return to the Fathers is seen to offer any real alternative to the impasse and sterility of Western theology for which Aquinas bears much of the blame.

A rather subtler position is adopted by Fr Georges Florovsky – a theologian almost universally held in the greatest of esteem in contemporary Orthodox circles. Florovsky's vision of a creative return to the Fathers is encapsulated in his notion of a “neo-patristic synthesis”. In this he is often lumped together with Lossky but his vision of what a neo-patristic synthesis might look like is rather different in practice. Palamas and, especially, Dionysius are far less decisive figures for Florovsky than for Lossky. Furthermore, and in contradistinction to Lossky, Florovsky' proposed synthesis explicitly embraces the Latin Fathers, above all Augustine. This positive embrace of Augustine is worlds away from Lossky's estimation of the Bishop of Hippo.

Florovsky is similarly removed from Lossy and Bulgakov in his constructive approach to Thomas and Thomism. In Florovsky, there is little hint of the caricatured vision of a rationalistic, scholastic, Thomist West found in his fellow Russian theologians. He explicitly denies that East and West are clearly delineated and opposing categories: “The antithesis of “West and East” belongs more to the polemical and publicistic phraseology than to sober historical thinking”.¹¹ Florovsky criticised Lossky on precisely this score:

[Lossky] probably exaggerates the tension between East and West even in the patristic tradition. A “tension” there obviously existed, as there were “tensions” inside the “Eastern tradition” itself, e. g., between Alexandria and Antioch. But the author seems to assume that the tension between the East and the West, e. g., between the Trinitarian theology of the Cappadocians and that of Augustine, was of such a sharp and radical character as to exclude any kind of “reconciliation” and overarching synthesis.¹²

Florovsky made the same point even more forcefully at the inauguration of St Vladimir's Seminary, New York, arguing that East and West are manifestly “offsprings of the same root” in that they share the same Hellenic and Roman parentage. They should be regarded as sisters or, better, Siamese twins (“conjoined” is the preferred term these days) – dangerously and tragically separated and incomplete without the

¹⁰ Lossky 1974d, 80.

¹¹ Florovsky 1989, 191.

¹² Florovsky 1958, 207.

other: “neither is self-explanatory, neither is intelligible when taken separately”. His envisaged neo-patristic synthesis is explicitly geared to the reintegration of East and West.¹³

Florovsky was, however, deeply allergic to what he saw as the pernicious influence of Western theology and philosophy on Russian theology from early Muscovy down to modern times. This is the master-theme of his greatest work, *Ways of Russian Theology* (1937). This extraordinary work details the tragic story of the displacement of Russian theology from its proper patristic and Byzantine foundations and its steady malformation or “pseudomorphosis” under the baneful spell of Western doctrines and thought-forms. But this tale of woe should not on any account be read as an attack on Western theology *per se*.

Florovsky’s approach to Western theology in its own terms is conditioned by his distinctive understanding of “Christian Hellenism”, that is to say the Church Fathers’ remarkable and perennially relevant marshalling of the resources of classical philosophy in the service of the Christian revelation. This was, of course, a conscious rebuttal of Adolf von Harnack’s attempt to single out Greek philosophy as the chief source of the corruption and decadence of patristic thought. Christian Hellenism is a broad category for Florovsky:

Christian Hellenism is much wider than one is prepared to realize. St Augustine and even St Jerome were no less Hellenistic than St Gregory of Nyssa and St John Chrysostom. St Augustine introduced Neoplatonism into Western theology. Pseudo-Dionysios was influential in the West no less than in the East, from Hilduin up to Nicholas of Cusa. And St John of Damascus was an authority both for the Byzantine Middle Ages and for Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas. Thomism itself is surely Hellenistic.

This recognition of Thomas and Thomism as representatives of Christian Hellenism is quite an accolade in Florovsky’s book and allows for some very constructive positions. For instance, Florovsky will not accept Lossky’s denial of an authentically apophatic current in Thomas and Thomism: “Lossky dismisses the Thomistic versions of the ‘negative theology’ probably too easily”. Elsewhere, he remarks ruefully that many Orthodox may even be rather disappointed to find in Thomas a tangible mystical and apophatic dimension founded especially on his immersion in Dionysius the Areopagite.¹⁴

Writing to Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov) about Lossky’s work in a letter of 1958, he cautions, “With respect to the Western (Roman) theology, I myself prefer cautious judgments. First, we should not over-generalize and lump all ‘Latin’ theology together. In particular, Duns Scotus deserves more attention than he is paid under the

¹³ Florovsky 1948.

¹⁴ Florovsky Archive, 1955.

hypnosis of Thomism".¹⁵ Orthodox theology has much to learn from the West. As he puts at the conclusion of his *Ways of Russian Theology*:

The Orthodox thinker can find a more adequate source for creative awakening in the great systems of "high scholasticism", in the experience of the Catholic mystics, and in the theological experience of later Catholicism than in the philosophy of German Idealism or in the Protestant critical scholarship of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, or even in the "dialectical theology" of our own day.¹⁶

Florovsky's vision of a "neo-patristic synthesis", then, expressly includes a sustained and sympathetic engagement with Western theology. Florovsky's allergy to Western influence on Orthodox theology (*pseudomorphosis*) does not entail a rejection of the Western theological achievement. On the contrary, Orthodox theology will only find its distinctive and authentic voice through an honest and constructive engagement with Western theology at its best – and most especially with the "high scholasticism" of Aquinas and Scotus. This is a very different vision to that which we encountered in Lossky and Bulgakov. East and West are not opposites in Florovsky but potential allies.

This aspect of Florovsky's treatment of Latin theology has rarely been fully appreciated. Indeed Florovsky is often lumped in with Lossky as an exponent of the eternal opposition betwixt East and West. Lossky's approach, as we have seen, is more closely analogous with that of Bulgakov and forms part of a current of oppositional theology going back to the Russian Slavophiles and their campaign against the so-called Westernizers. John Meyendorff (1926–1992) also stands in this broad current, treating Aquinas as the archetypal representative of the Western other and raising up St Gregory Palamas as a kind of anti-Thomas.

Perhaps the most acutely polarized account of East and West in modern Orthodox theology is that offered by Fr John Romanides (1927–2001). Romanides launched himself onto the Greek theological scene with a no holds barred attack on Augustine. Romanides traces the ills of the modern West squarely back to the Bishop of Hippo. He sets Augustine and his "Franco-Latin" epigones (Aquinas being the chief of these) in stark contrast to "the Biblical and Patristic line of thought" represented by the Greek Fathers, all of whom are presented as Palamites *avant la lettre*.¹⁷ Romanides' invigorating insights have won many adherents in somewhat more traditionalist circles of modern Orthodoxy but his sweeping denunciation of Augustine and all subsequent "Franco-Roman" theology produces an impossibly simple stand-off between biblical-patristic-Palamite East and philosophical-Augustinian-scholastic West.

¹⁵ Sakharov 2008, 79–81.

¹⁶ Florovsky 1979, vol. 2, 303.

¹⁷ He expresses his world-view in a nutshell in the opening pages of Romanides 2004. His critique of Augustine is outlined at length in his dissertation of 1957 = Romanides 1989.

All this is very different to Florovsky with whom Romanides maintained an extensive correspondence but who unambiguously recognised Augustine as a Father of the Church and for whom Latin scholasticism had an indispensable part to play within his proposed neo-patristic synthesis.¹⁸ Christos Yannaras presents a more sophisticated but essentially analogous form of anti-Westernism. Yannaras is less concerned with Augustine than is Romanides and focuses rather on Aquinas as his chief bugbear. Demetrios Kydones' translation of the *Summa contra gentiles* in 1354 marks, for Yannaras, a melancholy moment: the beginning of the end of "real Hellenism", the gradual overcoming of the living tradition of the Gospel and the Greek Fathers by the West: "the great historical cycle which started motion in 1354 with Demetrios Kydones as its symbolic marker seems to be coming to a conclusion in the shape of Greece's absorption by Europe – the final triumph of the pro-unionists". Aquinas, for Yannaras, is the embodiment of Western rationalism, individualism, and legalism.¹⁹

Yannaras' approach shares much with Philip Sherrard's *The Greek East and Latin West*, published in 1959. The fissure between Greek East and Latin West is presented by Sherrard in the form of a "curious inner dialectic" within Western thought proceeding from Augustine through Aquinas to Descartes and in which reason is divorced from revelation and elevated to wholly autonomous status.²⁰ This process is held ultimately accountable for many of the subsequent ills of Western society, most notably in the environmental sphere. In sharp contrast stands the Greek patristic tradition, interpreted largely in Dionysian and Palamite terms, with its accent on intuitive and unmediated knowledge, mystical experience, and the participatory relationship between the world and its God. A similar account of rationalistic West versus mystical East is found in Zissimos Lorentzatos, articulated most clearly in his famous essay on George Seferis, "The Lost Centre" (1962).²¹ Lorentzatos presents the mystical tradition as the defining characteristic of the Greek spiritual tradition. That tradition may have been "consistently ignored and deformed" by the rationalistic and humanistic West (especially since the Greek Revolution of 1821) but it remains a living and accessible reality – accessible even to Western poets of a more mystical bent such as Blake and Yeats.

Modern Orthodox theology is not, of course, wholly in thrall to a paradigm of polar opposition between East and West. There are far subtler treatments in figures such as Demetrios Koutroubis (1921–83), Panayiotis Nellas (1936–86), Nikos Nissiotes (1925–86), Metropolitan John Zizioulas (1931–), and Metropolitan Kallistos Ware (1934–). And things are changing – indeed I would single out the beginning of a decline of

¹⁸ "Augustine is a Father of the Church Universal, and we must take his testimony into account, if we are to attempt a true ecumenical synthesis", Florovsky 1950, 156.

¹⁹ Yannaras cites not an Eastern but a Western source for his intuition: "Heidegger has assured us that Descartes represents the natural end result of Western scholasticism", Yannaras 1971, 286.

²⁰ Sherrard 1959, 139–164.

²¹ Lorentzatos 1980.

the paradigm of opposition as one of the single most significant developments in twenty-first century Orthodox theology. But the notion of East-West opposition is certainly still widely present in modern Orthodox theology and the idea that someone like Aquinas might be integrated into an Orthodox world-view has barely begun to register. In the final analysis, then, Kipling's opening lines in *The Ballad of East and West* still ring largely true: "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet".²² Aquinas is still routinely treated as an archetype of a West patently opposed to the East. Orthodox theologians today are still too often at variance with the suitably critical but admirably constructive and non-oppositional approach to Latin theology evidenced in the late Byzantine period.

A fine example of such an approach is St Gregory Palamas, a figure routinely held up within modern Orthodox circles as a kind of Orthodox equivalent to Thomas and an archetype of non-Western or anti-Western theology. The key development here is the widespread recognition that Palamas drew directly on that archetypal Westerner, St Augustine. Martin Jugie was the first to draw attention to this, observing some interesting parallels especially in the *One Hundred and Fifty Chapters (Capita)*.²³ Jugie's claims had little impact on subsequent scholarship. Indeed, the classic twentieth-century accounts of Palamas (Lossky and Meyendorff) rule out any possible affinity with Augustine. According to this Neo-Palamite narrative, there is clear blue water between Latin (essentialist) and Greek (personalist-existentialist) doctrines of the Trinity.²⁴ These polar positions are found in, respectively, Augustine and Aquinas, and the Cappadocian Fathers and Palamas. This narrative is marked out in Lossky's *Essai sur la théologie mystique de l'Église d'Orient* and in John Meyendorff's *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* and subsequent works. As one of Meyendorff's articles puts it:

All scholars today would agree the real difference between the Latin – Augustinian – view of the Trinity, as a single Essence, with personal characters understood as "relations", and the Greek scheme, inherited from the Cappadocian Fathers, which considered the single divine Essence as totally transcendent, and the Persons, or *hypostaseis* – each with unique and unchangeable characteristics – as revealing in themselves the Tri-personal divine life, was the real issue behind the debates on the *Filioque*.²⁵

The irony here is that Palamas has in recent years been attacked by a number of Western critics as precisely an essentialist, a theologian incapable of properly distinguishing the three divine persons. Catherine LaCugna, for example, finds the affirmation that the multiple energies of God are the single energy of the Trinity particularly trou-

²² But cf. *supra* on Kipling's own understanding of East and West.

²³ Edited by Robert Sinkewicz. See Jugie 1932, 1766.

²⁴ The personalist-existentialist reading of Palamas mirrors the analogous retrieval of Aquinas by Étienne Gilson, Jacques Maritain, and others.

²⁵ Meyendorff 1986, 674 (In lightly revised later versions of his article, Meyendorff backtracks slightly by modifying "all scholars" to "most").

bling. Failing to acknowledge the simple equation between nature and energy established by St Maximus the Confessor against Monoenergism (*in nuce*: energy pertains to nature not to person), LaCugna concludes that Palamas' teaching elides the particularities of the three persons and overall "sounds suspiciously similar to Augustine and Aquinas".²⁶ Dorothea Wendebourg (for whom Palamas is a functional modalist) also finds Palamas reminiscent of Augustine and characterises the triumph of Palamism as the "defeat of Trinitarian theology".²⁷

To add irony to irony: those who label Palamas an essentialist continue to vaunt him as archetypal of an Eastern theological tradition quite distinct from the West. LaCugna, for instance, presents Palamas and Aquinas as twin peaks of the "central ethos" of their respective opposing traditions of East and West.²⁸ LaCugna's vision of East and West is essentially that of Lossky and Meyendorff: Palamas and Aquinas presented as the twin summits of the mutually antagonistic theological traditions of East and West. The dichotomy between East and West is virtually an article of faith for these authors. Such a dichotomy would certainly seem to preclude any but merely accidental parallels between Gregory and Augustine. But substantive parallels, and even direct citations, there certainly are.

Meyendorff recognised in Chapter 36 of the *One Hundred and Fifty Chapters (Capita)* the existence of a striking "psychological" image of the Trinity in which the Holy Spirit presented as the mutual love of Father and Son. His initial reaction was that this was a "somewhat similar" image to that found in Augustine, allowing this to be a sign of Gregory's openness to the West.²⁹ Later, however, he downgraded the parallelism to "quite superficial".³⁰ But in either case, any substantial connection was deemed inadmissible.³¹

Recent work in this area has demonstrated that there is a substantial encounter with Augustine evident in Gregory's works. Reinhard Flogaus and John Demetracopoulos have (separately and independently) put forward a compelling case that Palamas made frequent use of Augustine, drawing directly on the translation of the *De Trinitate* made by Maximos Planoudes in c.1280.³² Gregory's encounter with Augustine is especially evident in Chapters 34–37 and 125–35 of the *Capita* (c.1349–50)

²⁶ LaCugna 1991, 194.

²⁷ Wendebourg 1980 and Wendebourg 1982.

²⁸ LaCugna 1991, 143–144.

²⁹ Meyendorff 1959b, 316 ("assez semblable"). Lossky, for his part, had previously declared such images to be unheard of in the East: Lossky 1944, 78 [ET 81].

³⁰ Meyendorff 1986, 673 and 679 n. 11. He states quite categorically that, "The Greek translation of Augustine's *De Trinitate* by Maximus Planoudes (+1310) remained the work of an isolated humanist, whose work was hardly ever used by Byzantine theologians".

³¹ Meyendorff had no particular animus against Augustine, and observes that in his insistence on the absolute necessity of grace, Gregory is "l'un des auteurs les plus 'augustiniens' de l'Orient chrétien", Meyendorff 1959b, 175.

³² Flogaus 1996a; Flogaus 1997a; and Flogaus 1998. J. Demetracopoulos 1997.

and indeed in other works from the mid to late 1340s onwards. In one case from the late 1350s, Palamas introduces a quotation from Augustine in these terms: “For as one of the wise and apostolic men has said [...].”³³ This quote reveals not only Gregory’s conviction of the authority of Augustine but also his sense of a need for a certain discretion in appealing to that authority. Other instances of appropriation embrace the motives of the incarnation (*Homily 16*), the meaning of death (*To Xena*), the four kinds of *logos* within man, and God’s possession of goodness and wisdom not as quality but as essence (*Capita 34–35*).

It is intriguing to find Palamas countenancing Augustine even at his most “essentialist” given that the dominant neo-Palamite narrative tends to distance Palamas from any taint or suspicion of “essentialism”. This calls for some further discussion, beginning with *Capita 36*. Here, Palamas speaks of the Holy Spirit as the “ineffable love” ($\xi\varphiως$) of the Begetter towards the Begotten. The Son “possesses this love as co-proceeding from the Father and himself and as resting connaturally in him”. Thus the Spirit is not only “of the Father” but also “of the Son”, who possesses him “as the Spirit of truth, wisdom, and word”. The Spirit is also intimated in Proverbs 8:30 in which the Word as Wisdom declares: “I was she who rejoiced together with ($\sigmaυνέχαρον$) him.” This verse leads Palamas to conclude that, “This pre-eternal rejoicing of the Father and the Son is the Holy Spirit who is, as has been said, common to both”. But this does not, he is careful to note, detract in any way from the fact that the Holy Spirit “has his existence from the Father alone and so proceeds from him alone according to his existence”.

Palamas unambiguously rules out the Latin *filioque* in respect of origination and existence of the Holy Spirit. But he equally clearly does not confine co-procession to the purely temporal mission of the Spirit. He is certainly allowing for some form of co-procession within the immanent eternal life of the Holy Trinity. There are antecedents for this kind of language in the Byzantine tradition: Maximus the Confessor’s intuition of that procession “through” and “from” the Son are essentially equivalent; John of Damascus’ eternal “resting” of the Spirit in the Son; or Gregory of Cyprus’ eternal “shining forth” of the Spirit through the Son.³⁴ But such precedents cannot fully account for the astonishing parallels with Augustine’s notion of the Spirit as the “mutual love” of Father and Son.³⁵ The fact that Palamas goes on to propose a Trinitarian image in human beings in terms of the operation of mind, knowledge, and love only serves to make the connection with Augustine unmistakable.³⁶

This broadly sympathetic reception of some key features of Augustine’s Trinitarian teaching is, at first sight, puzzling. Palamas was a fierce opponent of the Latin

³³ Gregory Palamas, *Against Gregoras* 2.43, ed.Chrestou IV: 296 (cf. *De Trinitate* 5.8.9).

³⁴ Maximus the Confessor, *Letter to Marinus* (PG 91 136AD); John of Damascus: *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* 8.173 (Kotter II: 25); Gregory of Cyprus: *Tomos* of 1285 (PG 142 240C).

³⁵ *De Trinitate* 15.6.10, 15.17.29, 15.19.37, 15.26.47.

³⁶ Greg. Pal., *Capita* 37, Chrestou. Cf. Aug., *De Trinitate* 9 (*passim*).

filioque and yet he embraces some of the key images of Augustine, the foremost expositor of the offending doctrine. In his anti-Latin *Apodictic Treatises* (c.1336), Palamas insists on procession from the Father alone. But even here Palamas reveals himself to be rather more than an uncompromising monopatrist, unable to think beyond the temporal mission of the Spirit by the Son. Fully aware of patristic support for the involvement of the Son in the eternal procession of the Spirit (for example, Cyril of Alexandria's *Thesaurus*), Palamas produces a remarkably constructive approach to the whole problem.

Palamas is clear that one cannot speak of the procession of the hypostasis of the Spirit from the hypostasis of the Son. The Spirit has his existence and particular mode of being from the hypostasis of the Father alone. But we can speak of the Spirit's being from the Father and the Son, or from the Father through the Son, in terms of nature. Because of the consubstantiality of Father and Son, the Spirit may be said to be "naturally from the Son and from his essence", manifesting the Spirit's own consubstantiality with the Father and the Son.³⁷ This eternal divine movement has its temporal counterpart: "The Spirit eternally flows-forth from the Father into the Son and becomes manifest in the saints from the Father through the Son".³⁸ It is "nothing new" to say that "the Spirit goes forth from the Son and from his nature".

Palamas, in short, allows for what we might call an "Orthodox *filioque*" both in respect of the eternal divine life and the manifestation of the divine operation or energy among creatures. But he remains adamant that the hypostasis of the Father is the sole originating principle of the divinity. While there can be no question of adding the offending word to the Creed, or of accepting the *filioque* in terms of origination, Palamas' capacity to embrace co-procession on both eternal and temporal planes helped prepare the ground for his positive reception of Augustine in later works. This is not a case of a simple Easterner being so impressed by Augustine as to embrace some of his ideas at the expense of the coherence of his own doctrine. Augustine appealed to Palamas precisely because of the underlying similarity of their approaches to the mystery of the Trinity. Palamas has an acute sense of the unity of God that is quite as "essentialist" as anything one might find in Augustine but which remains, like Augustine's, properly alive to the distinction of persons.

In sum, Palamas' use of Augustine emerges as perfectly consistent with his broader theological programme. Before his encounter with Augustine, Palamas had already established a highly constructive approach to the vexed issue of the *filioque* that enabled him to adopt a remarkably tolerant approach to the Latin tradition and formulae when viewed outside the context of East-West polemics. Allowing for co-procession in terms both of essence and of energy, Palamas was predisposed to look favourably on Augustine. This sympathetic reading does not amount to any sort of

³⁷ Greg. Pal., *Apodictic Treatise* 2.67, Chrestou I: 138–39.

³⁸ Greg. Pal., *Apodictic Treatise* 2.58, Chrestou I: 131.

decisive influence: Palamas' theological vision was well-developed and articulated before he happened upon the Planoudes translation. The *De Trinitate* served, rather, as a confirmation of aspects of his own theological vision –including, with some essential caveats, the disputed matter of the *filioque*.

This remarkable encounter stands as a clear sign of the openness of Palamas to Latin theology. In this respect, the encounter serves to foreshadow the capacity of many Palamites (and anti-Unionists) to be ardent admirers of Thomas Aquinas, one of Augustine's most prominent epigones. But the fact that an “archetypal Easterner” should embrace an “archetypal Westerner”, as Palamas does Augustine, is strange only if one begins with the assumption of an East–West dichotomy (with attendant archetypes) in the first place. What is really puzzling is the fact that so many observers across the theological spectrum have approached the issue under precisely such an assumption. A serious engagement with Augustine is thus simply out of the question for virtually all critics and admirers of Palamas alike.³⁹ But a serious engagement there was, and one which must press us to question further the hackneyed dichotomy of East and West.

Palamas was also, it should be affirmed, heir to a long tradition of Byzantine scholasticism as indeed he was to the earlier patristic tradition and the whole mystical, apophatic, and monastic edifice of the Christian East. Palamas drew on his own relatively extensive philosophical training in his dispute with Barlaam of Calabria, the first in a series of critics of certain of the beliefs and practices of the Hesychast monks of Mount Athos. This is a dispute that began not over techniques of prayer or the vision of divine light but over the correct application of Aristotle. Taking exception to the Calabrian's theological agnosticism, Palamas asserted in unmistakably Aristotelian terms the propriety of apodictic (demonstrative) argumentation in the theological realm.

Barlaam, although no mean student of logic himself, was deeply sceptical about the possibility of any rational argumentation in relation to the divine and scornful of the Latin dependence on syllogisms.⁴⁰ In stark contrast, Palamas explicitly defends the Latin use of the syllogism, declaring that “we have in truth been taught by the Fathers to syllogize about [theological matters], and no one would write even against

³⁹ To the critics already mentioned (LaCugna, Wendebourg, Jenson) we may add Gerhard Podskalsky, for whom Palamas' acquaintance with Augustine barely impinges on his broader scheme of methodological opposition between East and West (Podskalsky 1977c, 176–177 and *passim*). To the admirers (Lossky, Meyendorff) we may add David Bradshaw who characterizes Palamite theology as a reaction to Barlaam's alleged Augustinianism and seems barely to register Palamas' own use of Augustine; Bradshaw 2004, 222.

⁴⁰ On Barlaam's conception of theology, see Sinkewicz 1982. I follow Sinkewicz in seeing only minimal direct acquaintance with Western scholasticism (including Thomas) in Barlaam's works of this period.

the Latins because of this".⁴¹ Palamas insists on the necessity of rational discourse and will not hesitate to use the syllogism in the defence of revealed truth, after the pattern of the Fathers.⁴² Gregory Akindynos attacks Palamas in strictly traditional terms, berating him for departing from patristic tradition (which he cites *ad nauseam*) and deploying the hoary tactic of associating the innovations of his opponent with a panoply of heresies of old.⁴³ Nikephoros Gregoras, the third prominent leader of the anti-Palamite party, displays a positive allergy to Aristotle and refuses all utility to the syllogism, seeing it as a tool fit only for feeble minds, such as those of the Latins.⁴⁴ There is a certain irony in the fact that the chief legacy of the anti-Palamites is precisely the anti-rational obscurantism that Podsklasky deems the defining characteristic of Palamism.

To sum up, there is no sense in which Palamas' theology may justifiably be characterized as a defeat of reason (*pace* Podskalsky), or as the triumph of an anti-scholastic mystical theology (*pace* Lossky *et alii*), or as anti-Latin. It is this scholastic current in Palamas and his own positive but duly critical disposition towards Latin theology that was to pave the way for the sympathetic reception of Thomas by a surprising number of Palamites.

Now for someone else who sympathised with Latin theology (but was rather less coy about it): Demetrios Kydones. Kydones (himself an anti-Palamite) offers some compelling reflections on East-West theological relations in the Palaeologan period. From the moment of his first encounter with Aquinas, Demetrios felt a passionate vocation to make the riches of Latin learning available in Greek. Like many of his compatriots, he had not expected much from the Latins who were generally to be encountered as merchants and seamen. But through his study of Thomas, it had become clear to him that the Latins too had people of the highest intellectual attainments.⁴⁵ He pours scorn on the apparently common assumption of Roman superiority, especially the enduring belief that the world is divided between Greeks and barbarians, that is between the Romans and the rest. In this scenario, the Romans are the heirs of Plato and Aristotle and the Latins barely recognisable as human, fit only for menial activities such as inn-keeping.⁴⁶ The West is, emphatically, not the best – *pace* Jim Morrison. Demetrios acknowledges the estrangement and mutual ignorance that has built up between Romans and Latins over time.⁴⁷ His translations are clearly intended to stand in the breach. Demetrios believed that it is principally language that divides

⁴¹ Greg. Pal., *First Letter to Akindynos* 8, Chrestou I: 211.3–5. Palamas finds patristic support for the syllogism, as employed by the Latins, in Basil the Great and Euthymios Zigabenos.

⁴² See, for example, Greg. Pal., *First Letter to Akindynos* 9, Chrestou I: 212–213.

⁴³ For an extremely sympathetic estimation of Akindynos, see Nadal Cañellas 2006.

⁴⁴ See Ierodiakonou 2002b, 221–224.

⁴⁵ Demetrios Kydones, *Apology* I, ed. Mercati, Vatican City 1931: 364.37–41.

⁴⁶ Dem. Kyd., *Apol.*, Mercati: 365.77–84.

⁴⁷ Dem. Kyd., *Apol.*, Mercati 365.86–366.87.

East and West. Turning away from contemporary disagreements to the witness of the ancient Fathers of East and West he finds that they are in complete harmony, formed by and founded upon the same scripture and guided by the same Spirit.⁴⁸ He decries those who reject this harmonious testimony, rejecting the Latin Fathers and accepting only that of those who hail from the East. Such men are guilty not only of absurdity but also of blasphemy, falling ultimately into the errors of Arius and Sabellius.⁴⁹ This is a theme he returns to after a long discussion of primacy and of the various merits of New and Old Rome, condemning those who follow “Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, John, and Cyril” but refuse to pay heed to the teachings of Fathers long venerated liturgically by the Church, “Hilary, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Leo, and Gregory”, purely on the grounds of language.⁵⁰ Such a contumelious attitude is to make of an accident of geography a theological divide (“as far as the East is from the West” – an allusion to Psalm 103) that simply is not there.⁵¹ This absurd conflation of geography and theology, he writes, represents a manifest betrayal of the truth, truth being the property neither of Asia nor of Europe.⁵² Demetrios is certainly aware of a tendency to make the geographical West into a theological category but he resists any such notion with all the forces at his disposal.

In his enthusiastic embrace of Thomas, Demetrios was not welcoming in an alien culture to which he felt inferior; indeed he expressly denies any such sentiment.⁵³ Rather, he embraces Thomas as, essentially, “one of us”. Aquinas represents for Kydones the undivided faith of the Church: founded upon the common scriptures, proclaimed in the united witness of the patristic tradition, and expressed according to the best traditions of Greek philosophy. This sense of affinity is in large measure a sign of Aquinas’ own continuity with Eastern scholasticism and rootedness in the Greek patristic tradition. His mastery of Plato and Aristotle set the seal on what was really a kind of homecoming. He was, in effect, ushered into Byzantium as an honorary Hellene and a true Roman, bringing to the City, in the words of the Divine Liturgy, “thine own of thine own”.

There are any number of other Byzantine figures that may be used to explode the notion of an inherent East-West dichotomy but I shall confine myself to the two leaders of the anti-unionist party: St Mark of Ephesus and George (Gennadios) Scholarios. As Metropolitan of Ephesus, Mark Eugenikos (c. 1394–1445) was the most determinedly anti-unionist member of the Greek delegation at the re-union council of

48 Dem. Kyd., *Apol.* Mercati 367.46–368.51.

49 Dem. Kyd., *Apol.* Mercati 368.62–79. Kydones composed a separate treatise in defence of the Latin Fathers, for which see Kianka 1983.

50 Dem. Kyd., *Apol.* Mercati 382.35–40, citing Psalm 102(3):12.

51 Dem. Kyd., *Apol.* Mercati 383.53–57.

52 Dem. Kyd., *Apol.* Mercati 399.83.

53 Dem. Kyd., *Apol.* Mercati 384.71–74.

Ferrara-Florence (1438–39).⁵⁴ While this council witnessed a level of real theological debate, exchange, and rapprochement far in excess of that achieved at the earlier reunion council of Lyons (1274), it was to prove similarly ineffectual. As the chief spokesman for the Orthodox cause at the council, Mark consistently opposed any sort of compromise with Roman Catholic positions. But while Mark would have no part in even the slightest surrender to the Latin positions on key matters such as the papacy, *filioque*, and purgatory, he was by no means hostile to Latin theology *per se*.

Mark's approach to theology is distinctly scholastic in the traditional Byzantine mode. He had been very well trained in Aristotelian philosophy and argumentation by John Chortasmenos and continued to draw on that training throughout his tumultuous career.⁵⁵ He was, in particular, a forthright advocate of the theological syllogism, producing a set of works based expressly on the syllogism: *Syllogistic Chapters against the Latins on the Procession of the Holy Spirit*; *Ten Syllogisms Demonstrating that there is No Purgatorial Fire*; and *Syllogistic Chapters against the Heresy of the Akindynists concerning the Distinction between the Divine Essence and Energies*.⁵⁶ Like Palamas and indeed Aquinas he expressly commends and embraces syllogistic reasoning even in the highest realms of theology – so long as proper subservience to the authority of scripture and the Fathers be maintained.

Mark was a systematic thinker, presenting many of his works in the form of *aporiae*, objections, and solutions. He does not hesitate to employ philosophical argumentation where appropriate and can even be found citing Aristotle in support of the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone.⁵⁷ Mark also had an exacting knowledge of the patristic tradition and was adept at forensic discussion of issues of textual authenticity. Mark, in other words, was not content to retreat into apophaticism or mysticism but perfectly prepared to beat the Latins at their own game, arguing systematically for the Greek position on the basis of scripture, the Fathers (correctly transmitted), and philosophy. Naturally enough, this robust approach led him to take on Thomas Aquinas directly in some of his works. Mark treats Thomas as the archetypal “teacher of the Latins” and shows a fair acquaintance with his work in so doing: he certainly knew at least some of Thomas’ works at first hand.

While Mark could not fail to take issue with Thomas in his treatments of Latin positions on the disputed questions between East and West, it is significant that his approach remains temperate and respectful. He even attempts to recruit Thomas to the Orthodox cause on occasion. But what is most significant is that there is, in this supreme and even archetypal defender of Orthodoxy, no trace of any fundamental incompatibility between Latin and Greek theological methodologies. Thomas, and the Latin Church in general, are taken on at their own game. We see here, in other words,

⁵⁴ PLP 6193. See also Gill 1964, 55–64, 222–232; Tsirpanlis 1974; and, especially, Constas 2002b.

⁵⁵ On Chortasmenos, see PLP 30897 and Hunger 1969.

⁵⁶ Edited in, respectively, Petit 1977 and Gass 1899.

⁵⁷ G. Schol., *Syllogistic Chapters against the Latins on the Procession of the Holy Spirit* §29, ed. Petit 92.

a competition between rival scholasticisms, competing in their conclusions but perfectly compatible in their approaches to the matter of theology. But for a truly searching and heartfelt engagement with Thomas on the part of a thoroughgoing Aristotelian and anti-unionist we have to turn to the man to whom Mark committed the leadership of those opposed to the Florentine union, George Scholarios.

George (later Patriarch Gennadios) Scholarios (c.1403–c.1472) has the distinction of having been an exceptionally fervent Thomist and a committed Palamite, an advocate of the Florentine union and, later, the leader of the anti-unionist party in the last few years of the Byzantine imperium.⁵⁸ He appears to have first encountered Thomas through his Aristotelian commentaries and philosophical works and was to translate a number of these, including the commentaries on the *De anima* and the *Posterior Analytics* and the treatise *De esse et essentia*.⁵⁹ George made Thomas the lynchpin of his teaching at the school of grammar and philosophy he opened in Constantinople at this time.⁶⁰ His Latin predilections soon attracted the accusations that he was a “Latinizer” – a charge he was never to be entirely free from.⁶¹ Scholarios made a translation of the *De esse et essentia* for a favoured student, Matthew Kamariotes, in which he declared himself to be Thomas’ most fervent disciple in either East or West: “I do not think that any of his disciples has honoured Thomas Aquinas more than I have; nor do I think that any follower of his need have any other Muse”. In saying this, Scholarios is keenly aware that Thomas’ value was by no means universally recognised in the West. The Franciscans are singled out for their attraction to the subtleties of more recent teachers (he mentions John (Duns) Scotus). Thomas, he declares, is to be valued above such epigones as the “most precise and correct”, “the most excellent and learned” – and because he, unlike them, has received the approbation of the Church of Rome, and not only that of the schools. In one note of slight caution, he admits that in “a few matters” Thomas differs from the teachings of the Orthodox Church but argues that such differences were not of Thomas’ making but rather the product of circumstance.⁶²

Scholarios was never to depart from this enthusiastic estimation of Thomas although he would often accentuate the note of caution in subsequent works. In an *avis au lecteur* added somewhat later to the same translation, after he had made a name

58 PLP 27304. The most detailed treatment of Scholarios’ life and times is now Blanchet 2008c. For a general account, Tinnefeld 2002d is *sans pareil*. See also Jugie 1941; Turner 1969a; and Gill 1964, 79–94. Scholarios’ complete works have long been edited: Louis Petit, Xenophon Sidéridès and Martin Jugie (eds.), *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios* (hereafter OC).

59 On Gennadios’ encounter with Thomas, see especially Jugie 1930b; Barbour 1993a; Podskalsky 1974a; Salaville 1924. See also the chapter by Golitsis in this volume.

60 Scholarios also translated works on logic of Peter of Spain, Gilbert de la Porée, and Radulphus Brito. On Brito, see Ebbesen and Pinborg 1981–1982b.

61 Schol., OC I, Petit et al., 376–89 (Opus 75): an extensive and pained *apologia* defending himself from this perennial slur.

62 *Prooemium* to the translation of Thomas’ *De esse et essentia* (Opus 138), OC VI, ed. Petit et al., 179–80.

as an opponent of Latin theological errors, Scholarios observes: “This Thomas, although he was Latin by race and doctrine, and thus differs from us in those things in which the Roman Church has in recent times innovated, is, in other respects, wise and profitable for those who read him.” He praises Thomas’ exegetical, philosophical, and other works, noting that a great many have been translated. Where Thomas differs from the ancestral faith (ἢ πατρία δόξη), he must be rejected – and Scholarios is at pains to underline his own extensive and well-known contributions to such necessary rebuttal. But Thomas remains of enormous value, as a witness to the universal patristic tradition of Asia and of Europe, of Greek Fathers and Latin – the common inheritance of Christians. As was the case with Demetrios Kydones, Scholarios was not welcoming in a foreign import but recognising “one of us” – albeit in unfamiliar Latin garb. Notwithstanding his unfortunate aberrations, Scholarios says, “we love this divinely-inspired and wise man”.⁶³

Throughout the various turmoils of his life, Scholarios made sure to have Thomas’ works with him whenever possible. In the years following his retirement from the patriarchal throne, when he was subject to periodic displacement at the whim of the Sultan or of other Ottoman potentates, he composed epitomes of the *Summae* for ready portability.⁶⁴ In his preface to his abridged version of the *Summa contra gentiles* and the *prima pars* of the *Summa theologiae*, Gennadios gives yet another testimony of his undying love for the angelic doctor. He admits that the author is a Latin and thus bound to adhere to his own ancestral faith where this differs from that of the Orthodox. Scholarios is careful to limit the points of real difference to two: the procession of the Holy Spirit and the essence-energies distinction. Once again he underlines his own great and sacrificial contributions to the refutation of these Latin errors. But otherwise, Thomas is to be admired and heeded for his astonishing works of theology, exegesis, and philosophy. He is quite simply “the most excellent expositor and interpreter of Christian theology in those matters in which his Church accords with ours”.⁶⁵

Scholarios remained convinced of the underlying unity of the two ecclesial traditions and of the possibility, in God’s own time, of a true dogmatic union. Such convictions were nourished largely by his searching and life-long engagement with Thomas. Thomas functioned for Scholarios as an embodiment of all that united East and West, most especially their shared patristic and philosophical tradition.

⁶³ Schol., *OC VI*, ed. Petit et al., 177–78.

⁶⁴ Schol., *Epitome of the Summa contra gentiles*, *OC V*, ed. Petit et al., 1–338 (Opus 139); *Epitome of the first part of the Summa theologiae*, *OC V*, 338–510 (Opus 140), *Epitome of the prima secundae*, *OC VI* 1–153 (Opus 141).

⁶⁵ Schol., *OC V 1–2*, ed. Petit et al.: ἀριστος τῆς χριστιανικῆς θεολογίας ἐξηγητής καὶ συνόπτης, ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία αὐτοῦ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ συνάδει.

Concluding Remarks

The assumption of theological dichotomy between Christian East and West has long passed its sell-by date. If we look at the supposed archetypes of East and West, Gregory Palamas and Thomas Aquinas, we can see that both are profoundly ill-served by being presented as pinnacles and summations of their respective traditions. In *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas* I present a sketch of a very “Eastern” Thomas, a devoted student of the Greek Fathers, a pioneer in the use of material from the later Ecumenical Councils, and an enthusiastic propagator of near-contemporary Byzantine exegetical sources.⁶⁶ This Thomas, far from being an innovator in theological methodology was, rather, the heir to a long tradition of Byzantine scholasticism – and one who took that tradition to new heights of lucidity and sophistication. In this paper I have depicted Palamas as someone one who shared fully in that same tradition of Byzantine scholasticism, being steeped in Christian Aristotelianism and expressly committed to the defence of the proper place of reason within the theological sphere. This is a Palamas prepared to build bridges across the Greek-Latin divide even in the supremely controversial matter of the *filioque*, a Byzantine theologian able to assimilate distinctively Latin Fathers such as Augustine into his theological purview. Palamas approached the Latin tradition with a hermeneutic of orthodoxy being convinced, like Aquinas, of the underlying catholicity and harmony of East and West.

This sense of underlying catholicity and harmony is evident in the Byzantine and Early Modern Orthodox reception of Aquinas.⁶⁷ The most startling development is the emergence of a paradigm of opposition in the nineteenth century, a paradigm that achieved predominance in the twentieth century.⁶⁸ Theologians of the Byzantine and post-Byzantine era studiously refrained, with very rare exceptions, from positing any sort of substantial methodological or theological gap between Greeks and Latins. Critiques of Aquinas tend to be limited to the specific issues of contention and do not fan-out into global confrontations between East and West, still less into metaphysical stand-offs between personalism and essentialism, mysticism and rationalism, apophaticism and cataphaticism, or Palamism and Thomism. Such dichotomies are very much the preserve of the modern Orthodox mindset and do not accurately reflect the Byzantine legacy.

It is only with the Slavophiles in the early nineteenth century that an expressly reactive definition of Orthodoxy begins to take hold, shaped and inspired by German Idealism and Romanticism. Such oppositional theologizing became virtually normative in the twentieth century in the aftermath of the Russian Revolution. It is worth noting that the most oppositional phase of Orthodox theology was conditioned to some

⁶⁶ Plested 2012b, 9–28.

⁶⁷ Plested 2012b, 63–176.

⁶⁸ Plested 2012b, 177–219.

extent by vulnerability, the consequence of the collapse of the Russian Empire and the attendant émigré/refugee experience. Set adrift in a largely indifferent Catholic or Protestant context, it is perfectly understandable that so many Russian Orthodox theologians should have accentuated the differences between East and West, if only to get Orthodoxy noticed. One aspect of this oppositional strategy was the elevation of Palamas to the status of an anti-Aquinas in response to and in emulation of Catholic neo-Thomism. The oppositional mode of Orthodox self-definition was perpetuated by the experience of the Cold War during which East and West functioned as axiomatic geopolitical opposites. In a bipolar world, dichotomy makes perfect sense. In our own globalized and multipolar world we may be better positioned to eschew to simplistic dichotomies.

I shall conclude this article with a caveat. I have not said anything about developments in the Western intellectual sphere that have aided and abetted the development of this Orthodox theology of opposition. Orthodox theology has never developed in isolation from the Western theological tradition – and especially not in the modern era. Quite apart from specifically theological developments, we might think of the narrative of Western cultural superiority attending the Enlightenment and evident in the comments on Byzantium in Voltaire, Montesquieu, Gibbon, or Hegel. It is thanks to such figures that “Byzantine” is still a pejorative term in common English language parlance. The theory and practice of imperialism – expressed in Kipling’s “White Man’s Burden” rests on a related understanding of the necessary superiority of European and Western Christian culture. We might also think of Edward Said’s unforgettable if somewhat sweeping analysis of Western approaches to the East.⁶⁹ Or the analyses of the problems of the West in Spengler or Heidegger. Or the ascendancy of the Western political and economic model (democratic capitalism). I mention these examples briefly as illustrations of just some of the elements that have informed in many and various ways the emergence of dialectical theological discourse as the standard theological paradigm of modern Orthodoxy – whether this be through rejection, assimilation, appropriation, or complicity.

But to cut to the chase, the oppositional theologizing that has dominated Orthodox discourse in the twentieth century is, it seems to me, a sign of weakness rather than strength – to paraphrase Plato, a “failing of the wing”.⁷⁰ Contemporary Orthodox theology has no need of a caricature of the West against which to model itself in reaction. Nor need it fear the corrupting “influence” of the West, nor be afraid to learn from and embrace the best of the West – just as the Byzantines did in their constructive appropriation of Aquinas. The abandonment of the simplistic and hackneyed East-West dichotomy is, in short, long overdue. The Byzantines had no need of it. So let the twain meet! – as indeed, on closer inspection, they always have.

⁶⁹ Said 1978.

⁷⁰ Cf. Plotinus *Enneads* 4.8.1 paraphrasing Plato, *Phaedrus*, 248c.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abbreviations

ET	English Translation
OC	<i>Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios</i> (see below)
PG	<i>Patrologia Graeca (Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca)</i> , ed. J. P. Migne, 1857–1866
PLP	<i>Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit</i> , ed. E. Trapp, 12 vols. (Vienna 1976–1996)

Primary Sources

Augustinus. – *De Trinitate*. In Jacques Paul Migne (editor): *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina*. T. 42, Paris, 1865. Cols. 819–1098.

Barlaam. – *Oratio pro unione*. In Jacques Paul Migne (editor): *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*. T. 151, Paris, 1866. Cols. 1332–1342.

John Chortasmenos. – In H. Hunger, *Johannes Chortasmenos (ca. 1370 - ca. 1436/37) Briefe, Gedichte und kleine Schriften. Einleitung, Regesten, Prosopographie* (Wiener Byzantinische Studien 7), Vienna 1969.

Gregory of Cyprus. – *Tomos of 1285 (Scripta apologetica)*. In Jacques Paul Migne (editor): *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*. T. 151, Paris, 1865. Cols. 233–246.

John of Damascus. – *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*. In Bonifatius Kotter (editor), *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. II, Berlin 1973.

Demetrios Kydones. – *Apology I*. In G. Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuela Caleca e Theodore Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV* (Vatican City 1931), 359–403.

Mark Eugenikos. – Κεφάλαια συλλογιστικά κατά τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Ἀκινδυνιστῶν περὶ διακρίσεως Θείας οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργείας. In W. Gass (editor), *Die Mystik des Nikolaus Cabasilas vom Leben in Christo*, Leipzig 1899, Appendix II, 217–32.

Mark Eugenikos. – Συλλογιστικά κεφάλαια πρὸς λατίνους, and Συλλογισμοὶ δέκα δεικνύντες ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι πῦρ καθαρτήριον. In L. Petit (editor), *Marci Eugenici Metropolitae Ephesi opera anti-unionistica* 10/2, Rome 1977, 60–107 and 114–17.

Maximus the Confessor. Letter to Marinus. In In Jacques Paul Migne (editor): *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*. T. 91, Paris, 1865. Cols. 9–286.

Gregory Palamas. – Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ συγγράμματα (5 vols.). P. Chrestou (et alii), Thessalonica 1962–1992.

Gregory Palamas. – *Saint Gregory Palamas: The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters* (Studies and Texts 83). [= Capita], R. Sinkewicz, Toronto 1988.

Plotinus. – Enneads. In *Plotini opera*, 3 vols. P. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer (editors), Leiden 1951–1973.

Georges Scholarios. – *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios* (8 vols.), L. Petit, X. Sidéridès and M. Jugie (editors), Paris 1928–1936 [= OC].

Secondary Sources

Barbour, H. C. (1993a). *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios and His Translation of the Commentary of Armandus de Bellovisu on the “De Ente Ed Essentia” of Thomas Aquinas*. Studi Tomistici 53. Vatican City.

Barnes, M. R. (1995a). “Augustine in Contemporary Trinitarian Theology”. In: *Theological Studies* 56, pp. 237–325.

Barnes, M. R. (1995b). “De Régnon Reconsidered”. In: *Augustinian Studies* 26, pp. 51–79.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2008c). *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400–vers 1472): un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l’empire Byzantin*. Paris.

Bradshaw, D. (2004). *Aristotle East and West*. Cambridge.

Bulgakov, S. (1997). “The Holy Grail and the Eucharist”. In: ed. by B. Jakim. Hudson NY, pp. 76–83.

Constas, N. (2002b). “Mark Eugenikos”. In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*. Ed. by C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello. Vol. 2. Turnhout, pp. 411–464.

Demetracopoulos, J. (1997). *Αύγουστινος καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς. Τὰ προβλήματα τῶν Αριστοτελικῶν κατηγοριῶν καὶ τῆς Τριαδικῆς ψυχοθεολογίας*. Athens.

Ebbesen, S. and J. Pinborg (1981-1982b). “Gennadios and Western Scholasticism: Radulphus Brito's *Ars vetus* in Greek Translation”. In: *Classica et Mediaevalia* 33, pp. 263–319.

Flogaus, R. (1996a). “Der heimliche Blick nach Westen: Zur Rezeption von Augustins *De trinitate* durch Gregorios Palamas”. In: *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 46, pp. 275–297.

Flogaus, R. (1997a). *Theosis bei Palamas und Luther: ein Beitrag zum ökumenischen Gespräch*. Göttingen.

Flogaus, R. (1998). “Palamas and Barlaam Revisited: A Reassessment of East and West in the Hesychast Controversy of 14th Century Byzantium”. In: *St. Vladimir's theological quarterly* 42, pp. 1–32.

Florovsky, G. (1948). “The Legacy and Task of Orthodox Theology”. In: *Anglican Theological Review* 31, pp. 65–71.

Florovsky, G. (1950). “The Doctrine of the Church and the Ecumenical Problem”. In: *Ecumenical Review* 2, pp. 152–161.

Florovsky, G. (1955). “Typescript of a lecture on *The Vision of Unity*”. Florovsky Archive, Princeton University, Box 3, Folder 11.

Florovsky, G. (1958). “Review of V. Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, London 1957”. In: *The Journal of Religion* 38, pp. 207–208.

Florovsky, G. (1979). *Ways of Russian Theology*. 2 vols. Collected Works V and VI. Belmont, MA.

Florovsky, G. (1989). “Review of L. Zander, *Vision and Action* (London 1952)”. In: *Ecumenism I: A Doctrinal Approach*. Collected Works XIII. Vaduz, pp. 185–192.

Geanakoplos, D. (1966). *Byzantine East and Latin west: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance*. New York.

Gill, J. (1964). *Personalities of the Council of Florence*. Oxford.

Ierodiakonou, K. (2002b). “The Anti-Logical Movement in the Fourteenth Century”. In: *Byzantine Philosophy and Its Ancient Sources*. Ed. by K. Ierodiakonou. Oxford, pp. 221–224.

Jenson, R. (1999). “Systematic Theology I”. In: Oxford, pp. 152–153.

Jugie, M. (1930b). “Georges Scholarios et Saint Thomas d'Aquin”. In: *Mélanges Mandonnet. Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du Moyen Âge*. Ed. by P. Mandonnet. Paris, pp. 423–440.

Jugie, M. (1932). “‘Palamas, Grégoire’ and ‘Palamite, Controverse’”. In: *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*. Vol. 11. Paris, pp. 1735–1818.

Jugie, M. (1941). “Scholarios, Georges”. In: *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*. Vol. 14. Paris, pp. 1521–1570.

Kianka, F. (1983). "A Late Byzantine Defence of the Latin Church Fathers". In: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 49, pp. 419–425.

Kipling, R. (1991). *Something of Myself, and Other Autobiographical Writings*. Cambridge.

LaCugna, C. (1991). *God for Us*. San Francisco.

Lorentzatos, Z. (1980). *The Lost Center and Other Essays in Greek Poetry*. ET of "Τὸ Χαρέντο Κέντρο", tr. K. Cicellis. Princeton NJ.

Lossky, V. (1944). *Essai sur la théologie mystique de l'Église d'Orient*. Paris.

Lossky, V. (1974a). "Apophysis and Trinitarian Theology". In: *In the Image and Likeness of God*. ET of L'Apophase et la théologie trinitaire, Paris 1956.

Lossky, V. (1974b). *In the Image and Likeness of God*. New York.

Lossky, V. (1974d). "The Procession of the Holy Spirit in Orthodox Trinitarian Doctrine". In: *In the Image and Likeness of God*. ET of La procession du Saint-Esprit dans la doctrine trinitaire orthodoxe (Paris 1948). Also in *Eastern Churches Quarterly* 7.2 (1948), 31–52. New York.

Lossky, V. (1974e). "The Theology of Light in the Thought of St Gregory Palamas". In: *In the Image and Likeness of God*. ET of *La théologie de la lumière chez saint Grégoire de Thessalonique*, Dieu Vivant 1 (1945), 94–118.

Meyendorff, J. (1959b). *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas*. Paris.

Meyendorff, J. (1986). "The Mediterranean World in the Thirteenth Century, Theology: East and West". In: *The 17th International Byzantine Congress: Major Papers*. New York, pp. 669–682.

Nadal Cañellas, J. (2006). *La résistance d'Akindynos à Grégoire Palamas: enquête historique, avec traduction et commentaire de quatre traités édités récemment*. Louvain.

Plested, M. (2004). "'East is East and West is West': Grace in Augustine and Macarius". In: *Sobornost* 26.2, pp. 24–38.

Plested, M. (2012b). *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*. Oxford.

Podkalsky, G. (1974a). "Die Rezeption der thomistischen Theologie bei Gennadios II Scholarios". In: *Theologie und Philosophie* 49, pp. 305–323.

Podkalsky, G. (1977c). *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz. Der Streit um die theologische Methodik in der spätbyzantinischen Geistesgeschichte (14./15. Jahrhundert)*. Munich.

Podkalsky, G. (2004). *An Outline of Orthodox Patristic Dogmatics*. Rollinsford, NH.

Romanides, J. (1989). *Τὸ προπατορικὸν ἀμάρτημα*. 2nd ed. Athens.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York.

Sakharov, S. (2008). *Perepiska s Protoiereem Georgiem Florovskim*. Tolleshunt Knights.

Salaville, S. (1924). "Un thomiste à Byzance au XVe siècle: Gennade Scholarios". In: *Echos d'Orient. Revue d'histoire, de géographie et de liturgie orientales* 23, pp. 129–136.

Sherrard, P. (1959). *Greek East and Latin West*. Oxford.

Shezov, V. (2012). "The Burdens of Tradition: Orthodox Constructions of the West in Russia (late 19th – early 20th cc.)" In: *Orthodox Constructions of the West*. Ed. by G. Demacopoulos and A. Papanikolaou. New York, pp. 83–101.

Sinkiewicz, R. (1982). "The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God in the Early Writings of Barlaam the Calabrian". In: *Mediaeval Studies* 44, pp. 181–242.

Sinkiewicz, R. (2002). "Gregory Palamas". In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*. Ed. by C. Conticello and V. Conticello. Vol. 2. Turnhout.

Soloviev, V. (1889). *La Russie et l'Église universelle*. Paris.

Tinnefeld, F. (2002d). "Georgios Gennadios Scholarios". In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*. Ed. by G. Conticello and V. Conticello. Vol. 2. Turnhout, pp. 477–541.

Tsirpanlis, C. (1974). *Mark Eugenicus and the Council of Florence: A Historical Re-evaluation of his Personality*. Thessalonica.

Turner, C. J. G. (1969a). "The Career of George Gennadios Scholarios". In: *Byzantium* 39, pp. 420–455.

Wendebourg, D. (1980). *Geist oder Energie. Zur Frage der innergöttlichen Verankerung des christlichen Lebens in der byzantinischen Theologie*. Munich.

Wendebourg, D. (1982). "From the Cappadocian Fathers to Gregory Palamas. The defeat of Trinitarian theology". In: *Studia Patristica* 17.I, pp. 194–198.

Yannaras, C. (1971). "Orthodoxy and the West". In: *Eastern Churches Review* 3, pp. 286–300.

Yannaras, C. (1992). *Ὀρθοδοξία καὶ Δύση στὴ Νεώτερη Ἑλλάδα*. Athens.

John Monfasani

George of Trebizond, Thomas Aquinas, and Latin Scholasticism

George of Trebizond is something of a paradox. He is so to moderns most obviously because he fractures the supposed wall between humanism and Scholasticism. Despite being one of the leading humanists of the Quattrocento and one of the most important, if not the most important authority on rhetoric in the Renaissance up to the second half of the sixteenth century,¹ he vigorously and vociferously defended Scholasticism against the attacks of its critics. To be sure, in respect to the humanist-Scholastic divide, the paradox of George of Trebizond is in part a mirage created by modern presuppositions. After all many humanists tacitly or explicitly relied on Scholastic texts in their own writings.² Indeed, at the turn of the sixteenth century, one of them, Paolo Cortesi followed in George's footsteps in being both an important rhetorical authority and a conspicuous promoter of Scholastic thought, writing a commentary on Peter Lombard's *Four Books of Sentences* in which he took Thomas Aquinas as his main guide.³ But the paradoxes of George of Trebizond go deeper than superficial modern stereotypes and, as we shall see, involve the very substance of his Scholastic erudition and allegiance. We can begin by looking at what he himself tells us both deliberately and inadvertently about his connection to Scholastic learning.

In a late work addressed to Mehmed the Conqueror, he mentions in passing that when he lived in Naples, he used to read in the Dominican monastery of S. Domenico Maggiore.⁴ But apart from his three years in Naples, 1452–55,⁵ George spent most of his later life in Rome, where he had a house in the Piazza S. Macuto, that is to say, a few blocks from the University of Rome, where he used to teach, and around the corner from the Dominican monastery of S. Maria sopra Minerva, where he used to read and where he was eventually buried and to whose library, in 1473, he donated

¹ See Deitz's introduction to his edition of Trapezuntius, *Rheticorum libri*; and Monfasani 1976, 241–299.

² E.g., see Filelfo, *On Exile*, where §§ 113–123 and 127–150 of Bk. II of his dialogue *On Exile* are silently lifted from Albert the Great's commentary on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*; Kristeller 1985, 497, 567–584, on Pier Candido Decembrio's dependence in his treatise on the immortality of the soul on a twelfth-century treatise *De Spiritu et Animo* and on Thomas Cantimpratensis's *De Natura Rerum*, a dependency that “borders on plagiarism” (567); the “Indice degli autori” in Salutati, *De Fato et Fortuna*, 233 and 242, for Salutati's considerable dependency in his *De Fato et Fortuna* on Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas; and Collins 1974, for Marsilio Ficino's large borrowings from Thomas Aquinas.

³ See Garfagnini 1997.

⁴ See Monfasani 1984, 567, 573.

⁵ See Monfasani 1976, 114–137.

three manuscripts, an act which would tend to confirm that he had been a regular user of the library.⁶

In the preface to one of his earliest Aristotelian translations, that of the *Physics*, done in the early 1440s, George praised by name only two Scholastics, the Dominicans Albertus Magnus and Aquinas, adding that this praise extended – and I quote – “to all the extremely learned members of this Order, who very much devote themselves to Aristotle.”⁷ In his *Protectio Problematum Aristotelis*, which he completed in 1456 and which he expressly wrote in defense of Aristotelianism and the Latin Scholastic tradition, he mentioned John Duns Scotus and Walter Burley each once, Egidius Romanus twice, and Albert and Thomas multiple times. Indeed, he singled out Thomas Aquinas as the greatest of the Latin Aristotelian commentators, “a man who was not more outstanding in philosophy than he was in sanctity.”⁸

George’s admiration of Thomas Aquinas and of the Dominican Order in general is of course not surprising nor unusual for a fifteenth century Greek intellectual, as we know today. George would seem to have been a participant in the large movement of Byzantine Thomism that began with the translations of Demetrios Cydones the century before and that has been well illustrated and continues to be illustrated by many at this conference, starting with John Demetracopoulos.⁹ We shall see that this characterization is not completely true. Indeed, one could say that it is false and argue that George was not part of the movement of Byzantine Thomism. But to begin we need to ask when and how George came by his Thomism. We know he was called to Venice from his native Crete in 1416 by the Venetian nobleman Francisco Barbaro to serve as a scribe.¹⁰ He quickly learned Latin, however, and in a few years found employment as a teacher of Latin grammar and rhetoric, eventually publishing in the 1430s the sole full-fledged Latin *Rhetoric* of the Quattrocento, the *Libri Quinque Rheticorum*, which sought to meld the Byzantine rhetorical tradition, based on Hermogenes of Tarsus, with the Latin rhetorical tradition, based on Cicero.¹¹ So George’s early career offers no suggestion that he was much interested in philosophy or had studied Scholastic authors, let alone Thomas. Thierry Ganchou has discovered that in 1424 George and John Argyropoulos took part in a debate against each other in Crete.¹² Perhaps that

⁶ See Monfasani 1976, 142, 156, 179, 197–198, 236; and Barbalarga 1984.

⁷ Monfasani 1984, 142; “Nec vero dubito si Albertus ille, cui merito Magno cognomen est, aut Thomas, vir in philosophia summus, ceterique illius ordinis doctissimi homines, ui plurimum Aristoteli insudarunt, ornatiorem eum habuissent”

⁸ I have prepared a critical edition of *Protectio Problematum*, which I hope will appear soon. At § 719 of this edition, he spoke of Thomas as “vir non magis philosophia quam sanctitate precipuus” (= Mohler 1923–1942, vol. I, 341.27–28).

⁹ See J. A. Demetracopoulos 2002c; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2006b; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2007b; J. A. Demetracopoulos n.d.(a); Fyrigos 2004c; Podskalsky 1974c; and Podskalsky 1977d.

¹⁰ Monfasani 1976, 5, 8.

¹¹ See n. 1 above, and C. J. Classen 1993.

¹² Ganchou 2008.

experience eventually led both men to become students of Latin Scholasticism, with Argyropoulos earning a doctorate from the University of Padua in 1444 and George developing a serious interest in Scholastic texts.¹³ The first significant evidence for George's interest in Scholasticism is his *Isagoge Dialectica*, which he completed about 1439. Since the *Isagoge* seeks to adapt Scholastic logic to oratorical needs, George must have been reading Scholastic logical texts at least from the mid-1430s and probably even much earlier. Such an interest in logic and philosophy in the 1430s would explain how he felt comfortable on his own initiative in the early 1440s to begin to translate Aristotle. By 1447, in a span of roughly five years, he had translated Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, *Physics*, *De Anima*, *De Caelo*, and *De Generatione et Corruptione*.¹⁴ So by the start of the pontificate of Nicholas V in 1447 George had established himself not only as an admirer of Thomas Aquinas but also as an expert translator of Aristotle. He would go on to translate for Nicholas V the Aristotelian *Problemata* and the massive corpus of Aristotle's zoological works (*Historia Animalium*, *De Partibus Animalium*, and *De Generatione Animalium*).¹⁵ The only translator up to that point in time who could be compared to George in terms of the number and importance of Aristotelian works translated is William of Moerbeke. Fittingly, in the *Protectio Problematum Aristotelis* of 1456 George defended medieval translators like William for their faithfulness to the Greek text against the criticisms of Theodore Gaza, another Greek émigré translator.¹⁶

Everything said up to this point is prologue to George's great contribution to the Plato-Aristotle controversy of the fifteenth century, his *Comparatio Philosophorum Platonis et Aristotelis*, completed in Rome in 1457 and certainly in circulation by 1458.¹⁷ It is in this work that we should expect the full extent of George's Thomism to come to the fore. In point of fact the opposite is true. The *Comparatio* reveals George to have been far more a follower of the Franciscan brand of philosophy than of the Dominican, and, in fact, on some issues to have been an explicit opponent of Thomas Aquinas.

Philosophy occupies only a part of the *Comparatio*. History holds at least an equal part as George sought to prove that Platonism lay at the root of much of the evil in the world, from Christian heresy and Epicureanism to the fall of the Byzantine Empire, the rise of Islam, and the imminent danger posed by the paganism of George Gemis-

¹³ For George's *Isagoge Dialectica* see Monfasani 1976, 37–38, 328–337. On Argyropoulos' Scholasticism see Monfasani 1993.

¹⁴ See Monfasani 1976, 55–59; and Monfasani 1984, 698–705.

¹⁵ See Monfasani 1976, 72–78; and Monfasani 1984, 705–709.

¹⁶ George spoke well of, defended, or made use of to good effect of the “old translators” in the *Protectio Problematum* an extraordinary amount of times, to be precise, of the 724 sections of my forthcoming edition of the work, in §§ 7, 12–14, 67, 136–137, 251, 253, 282–284, 302, 307, 341, 472, 474–484, 488, 504–507, 529–530, 534, 541–546, 561–562, 567, 717.

¹⁷ See Monfasani 1976, 166, 169–170; Monfasani 1984, 600–602. I have prepared a critical edition and English translation of the work that I hope to see published in the near future and that I shall be quoting below.

tus Pletho.¹⁸ George's apocalyptic vision of the Antichrist lurked just behind much of his historical narrative.¹⁹ He also spent much of the third book of the *Comparatio*'s three books in an extended exegesis of the Platonic dialogues to make plain Plato's moral perversion and megalomaniac desires. Since the first of the three books is a rather straightforward comparison of the erudition of the two philosophers, what serious philosophy there is in the *Comparatio* is to be found in its Book 2. There George proves that Aristotle believed and taught the immortality of the soul (chaps. 12–16), the creation of the world *ex nihilo* (chaps. 9–11), the special creation of the human soul and its infusion into the body (chap. 16), the trinitarian nature of God (chaps. 4–7), and, finally, the reality of divine Providence (chap. 17).

George's treatment of the soul is for several reasons the best place to start in order to gauge his relationship with the Latin Scholastic tradition. George rejected as false the view that Aristotle held to a single agent intellect. He did not mention Averroes by name, no more than he did Avicenna. Instead, George argued, there is a *mundus intellectualis* consisting of a hierarchy of intellectual substances running from separated substances at the top "which some call intelligences and others call angels using the common name"²⁰ down to the rational soul, which, when separated from the body, is the lowest of the intelligences.²¹ Aristotle proves, George explained, that the vegetative and sensitive souls are mortal, and only the intellective soul is immortal, whose essential parts are the active intellect and the passive intellect. Since everything except God is a composite and since the principle of individuation is matter, intellective souls have a matter proportionate to them. This matter is the potential intellect. "According to Aristotle the potential intellect is twofold: one is a substance and essential part of the soul as its matter; the other is a certain force and power it has by which it thinks."²² George frequently quotes Aristotle in these chapters of the *Comparatio*, sometimes at length, to show that here he is elucidating the thought of Aristotle, and not his own personal beliefs, his main point being: "For if the First, as Aristotle says, does not have matter and is [thus] unique, all other things therefore necessarily have matter since they are not the First; but intelligences do not have corporeal matter,

18 These topics occupy most of the final Bk. 3 of the *Comparatio*, namely, chaps. 6–20. Pending the publication of my critical edition, the only available edition is the very faulty 1523, Venice edition with a title created by the editor Augustinus Claravallis, O.E.S.A.: *Comparationes Phylosophorum Aristotelis et Platonis*; see Trapezuntius, *Comparationes*.

19 See Monfasani 1976, 85–102, 128–136, 158–162, 185–194, 223–226.

20 Bk. II, chap. 13, § 2: "Hinc enim omnium separatarum substantiarum, quas alii intelligentias, alii communi nomine angelos nuncupant ..."

21 On this point, George agreed with Thomas Aquinas, *DEE*, c. 4, § 29, in Thomas Aquinas, *Opuscula Philosophica*, ed. R. M. Spiazzi, Rome, 1954, 14: "Et hoc completur in anima humana, quae tenet ultimum gradum in substantiis intellectualibus."

22 Bk. II, chap. 13, § 52: "Ita secundum Aristotelem duplex est intellectus potentia: alius substantia et pars essentialis animi veluti materia, alius vis quedam et virtus ipsius qua intelligit."

therefore they have potency proportionate to themselves.”²³ He then continues, and here I give a long quotation which will bring us to Thomas Aquinas:

Hence in particular intellectual species there necessarily are multiple individuals. For because of the multitude of potency, that is, of spiritual matter, there are produced from such matter numerically many forms of the same definition and nature, as we said when speaking about the stars. From this line of argument it is clear that also human souls are not combined into one single entity after death, but subsist as particulars because of their potency, which is the principle of their being individualized, and not because of an inclination that, as some say, they have to bodies. For this is like someone saying that the images individuated by mirrors, as if they were images through matter, would not cease to be in the mirrors once the latter were pulverized nor would they be combined into one in the air, but rather would preserve their individuation by an inclination which they retain to the broken mirrors. The wonder is that Thomas, a man outstanding in sanctity as in learning, can be read assenting to this last argument, especially since he left a certain book titled *De Esse et Essentia*, where he openly wants all intelligences besides the first to consist of being and essence, with one of the two serving as potency and the other as act. Thomas’ opinion does not differ from Aristotle’s other than in terminology, about which a philosopher should care little or nothing as long as the facts of the matter are grasped. The wonder therefore is, if he saw that intelligences are essentially act and potency, and that this is necessarily the case also for souls, why he did not preserve the individuation of souls through potency as he did the individuation of corporal things through matter, but, as if he were coerced and lacked a justification, took refuge in the inclination of souls to bodies rendered into a more common matter. Was it so that he might show that by the inclination of souls to bodies the resurrection of bodies could happen naturally? That must not be said. For we believe in the future resurrection not by the guidance of nature, but by faith.²⁴

As someone who had translated almost the whole Aristotelian corpus save the logical works and the *Metaphysics*, George believed – indeed, he felt he had an obligation – to

²³ Bk. II, chap. 15, § 9: “Nam si primum, ut ait, non habet materiam atque ideo unicum est, cetera necessario ideo habent quoniam prima non sunt, sed non corpoream, proportionatam ergo sibi potentiam.”

²⁴ Bk. II, chap. 15, §§ 27–33: “Hac ratione perspicuum est animos quoque humanos post mortem non in unum confundi, sed singulos subsistere propter potentiam, que individuandi principium est, nong, ut quidam aiunt, inclinatione quam habent ad corpora. Nam hoc simile est si quis diceret individuatas per specula quasi per materiam imagines, attritis speculis, nec desinere esse in ipsis nec in unum in aere confundi, sed servare individuationem suam inclinatione quam ad specula rupta retineant. Illud mirum est quod Thomas, vir tum sanctitate, tum scientia precipius, huic rationi assensisse legitur, presertim cum librum quandam reliquerit *De Esse atque Essentia* inscriptum, ubi aperte vult ex esse et essentia omnes intelligentias preter primam constare, et horum alterum esse potentiam, alterum actum. Que sententia non differt ab Aristotelica preter quam in vocabulis, de quibus nulla vel parva philosopho, dum res percipiatur, cura esse debet. Mirum ergo est, si actum et potentiam essentialiter esse intelligentias vidit, idque in animis similiter esse necesse est, cur individuationem animorum per potentiam sicut rerum corporalium per materiam non servavit, sed ad inclinationem eorum ad corpora in communio rem redacta materiam, quasi coactus ratione que carens, refugit. An ut resurrectionem corporum per inclinationem ad ipsa fieri naturaliter posse ostenderet? Non est dicendum. Resurrectionem enim non natura duce, sed fide futuram credimus. Quod si quid etiam natura huic rei possit conducere, totum id fidei ratione corroborari affirmarim.”

correct Thomas. George had, of course, also entered into one of the major controversies concerning Thomism in the later Middle Ages. I do not know which critics of Thomas, if any, George read. What is certain is that he was not reporting Thomas accurately. In the *De Ente et Essentia* Thomas did not speak of the inclination of separated souls to body. Worse, Thomas never used the analogy of broken mirrors in respect to the plurality of separated souls, but only alludes to it as an analogy to the full presence of Christ in the fragments of the Eucharistic host, but even here Thomas says that broken mirrors are not a perfect analogy since they involve numerically different reflections while in the Eucharist there is only one single consecration.²⁵ Whatever were George's sources, he clearly had allied himself with the tradition of universal hylomorphism that is traceable back to the eleventh-century Jewish philosopher Avicenna²⁶ and that was continued in the Latin West especially in the Franciscan philosophical tradition, from Roger Bacon and St. Bonaventure.²⁷ The fact that George also spoke in terms of spiritual matter connects him all the more to this tradition, and what is even more startling, he will go on to endorse the notion of the plurality of forms, which Thomas strenuously opposed.²⁸ But we have to be cautious about George consciously opting for a Franciscan tradition since early Dominicans also endorsed the notions of spiritual matter and the plurality of forms, and one Dominican, Robert Kilwardy, as Archbishop of Canterbury, condemned Thomas' teaching of the unicity of substantial form.²⁹ In any case, here is what George said about the plurality of forms:

Those who say, however, that with the advent of a more perfect form the preceding ones disappear, do not see that the matter that is tending towards the form which confers on it its end, always proceeds to generation by becoming more perfect. For Aristotle did not introduce the vegetative soul so that with the advent of the sensitive soul he would destroy it, but so that once the whole vegetative body became the subjected matter, he would perfect it. Similarly, he inserted the sensitive soul into the human body not in order to eject it once the rational soul was infused, but in order to perfect the whole sensitive body as the matter subject to the rational soul. It is even obvious from the residue that remains of the corrupted or removed soul, however, that the progression is made in this fashion so that, as he himself says, the more imperfect serving as matter might be subject to the more perfect. For it is body, not prime matter, that remains. But if the preceding souls do not remain, this happens because the more perfect soul is separated from the body or is corrupted on account of the preceding souls failing the more perfect soul, that is to say, the approximate matter [of the more perfect soul] wavers and ebbs away. For the more

²⁵ Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, III, q. 76, a. 3 co.

²⁶ See Pessin 2010.

²⁷ See Wood 1996; Spade 2008; Haldane 2010, 298–299 (Bonaventure); Hackett 2003, 623; and King 1994, 147. After Bonaventure, one can find spiritual matter even in an independent-minded Franciscan such as Peter Olivi (d. 1298); see Pasnau and Toivanen 2013. But in George's day, Franciscans had moved on from spiritual matter to *haec cietas* as the principle of individuation; see Hoenen 1996.

²⁸ See Zavalloni 1951, especially 261–272 for Thomas Aquinas.

²⁹ See Callus 1955.

remote matter remains in all things because the body had been assumed by the soul not from nothing, but from a more base body in a progression towards a more perfect body.³⁰

So George understood the prior forms remaining as the matter of the higher forms and being perfected in the process. How much his understanding of the plurality of forms accords with any other proponent of the doctrine, I am not prepared to say at the moment; but what is clear is that he stands in sharp and open disagreement with Thomas Aquinas' doctrine of the unicity of substantial form.

The most daring of George's assertions in the *Comparatio* is that Aristotle had an inkling of the Trinity. George makes it clear that he does not mean that Aristotle had knowledge of the three persons of the Trinity, but simply that he had a sense that God is somehow threefold. The key to George's claim is his exemplarism. As he explained:

Every body has length, width, and depth. Length is to be understood as being said of it alone and not of anything that suggests being composed of the other dimensions. Length is what people also call a line. Width has no depth; but it does have length. For the whole length is in the whole width. Width we also commonly call a plane. Depth, which is also called profundity, contains in itself the preceding two dimensions and is perfective of body. Thus, a body is these three things: length, width, and profundity; and if you mentally subtract one of the three (for in actual fact this is not something you can do), nothing remains. For not only will you have completely done away with the body, in actual fact you will be left with utterly nothing. A body therefore is these three things. Yet, it does not attain any composition from them. For even if a body is a composite, it is composed of matter and form, not of the dimensions. Hence, these three dimensions are one body, and one body is these three dimensions, but we reject out of hand any suspicion of composition being achieved out of them. What could be more expressive than this vestige? For the all-creating and blessed nature of divinity is three supposita, and these three are one without any suspicion of composition. ...

Adapt these things to the three persons who are God. The Father is from no thing. Length, or the line, is from no thing. You do not refute me by saying that the line is not from no thing in the absolute sense. For no created thing is from no thing in the absolute sense, but neither are the uncreated, except for the first supposit of the trinity; and when we say that the line is from no thing, we are speaking of it in comparison with other distances.³¹

³⁰ *Comparatio*, Bk. II, chap. 16, §§ 34–38: “Qui autem dicunt adveniente perfectiore forma precedentes evanescere, non vident materiam, cum tendat ad formam que finem afferat, generationi perficiendo semper procedere. Non enim vegetativam immissit animam ut, adveniente sensitiva, eam destrueret, sed ut, toto vegetante corpore loco materie subiecto, perficeret. Similiter in corpus humanum sensitivam induxit non ut, infusa rationali, eam eiiceret, sed ut totum sentiens corpus sicut subiectam sibi materiam perficeret. Quod autem progressus ita fiat, sicut ipse dicit, ut imperfectiora sicut materia perfectioribus subiiciantur, etiam a reliquis que remanent corrupta vel ablata anima patet. Corpus enim, non materia prima remanet. Quodsi precedentes anime non remanent, id fit quia perfectior eo separatur aut corrumptitur quoniam precedentes ipse deficiunt, id est, materia propinqua labascit et defluit. Remotior enim in omnibus remanet quia non a nihilo, sed a viiiore corpore ad perfectius ab anima corpus fuit assumptum.”

³¹ *Comparatio*, Bk. II, chap. 5, §§ 2–5, § 16: “Omne corpus longitudinem, latitudinem, et altitudinem habet. Longitudo sic intelligitur ut id quod dicitur solum sit nec quicquam ex aliis dimensionibus

George then cited the example provided by pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite:

Nonetheless, a heavenly man, Dionysius the Areopagite, thinks that the single light from three candles adequately renders the likeness as it exists in creatures, especially in creatures here below. For the light is one and three without division, the whole light of any of the candles in the whole of all the other candles without confusion. For if you were to remove one candle, its light would very distinctly follow with it. This likeness seems to me to work well enough for us to understand that the one God truly subsists and so does similarly any of the supposita. ... Nonetheless, a certain mixing seems to take place when the whole light is all together and also a disaggregation of the light [from one of the candles] when it is removed, something that is quite out of the question in things divine. But the individual attributes [of creatures] cannot perfectly correspond to the individual attributes [of God]. Hence, the relevant aspects of vestiges are taken only for the sake of understanding; and things so taken have to be understood in a higher sense and in a way that befits the divine majesty. For the creator exceeds his creatures by an infinite degree.³²

Whence he concluded: “From among all these and other similarities I myself am rather inclined to believe that no vestige can be found that is more expressive for us than is this likeness of the body.”³³

This all sets the stage for his proof of Aristotle’s trinitarianism:

sapiat, quam etiam lineam dicunt. Latitudo altitudinis nihil habet; longitudinem vero habet. Tota enim in tota est longitudo in latitudine. Hanc superficiem quoque nominare solemus. Altitudo, que profunditas etiam dicitur, utramque precedentium in se habet et corporis perfectiva est. Ita corpus tria hec est, longitudo, latitudo, et profunditas; et si unum de tribus mente subtraxeris (re enim facere minime poteris), nihil remanet. Nam non solum corpus omnino abstuleris, sed nihil penitus re ipsa reliqueris. Corpus igitur hec tria est. Nec tamen ullam ex ipsis habet compositionem. Nam etsi compositum est, ex materia tamen et forma, non ex ipsis compositum est. Quare tria hec unum corpus sunt, et hec tria corpus est unum, omni suspicione compositionis, que hinc fiat, procul reiecta. ... Accommoda hec tribus personis que deus sunt. Pater ex nullo est. Longitudo sive linea ex nullo. Nec mihi opponas non esse ex nullo simpliciter lineam. Nulla enim res creata ex nullo simpliciter est, sed ne increata quidem preter primum trinitatis suppositum, et quando dicimus lineam ex nullo esse, ad reliquias conferentes distantias dicimus.”

32 *Comparatio*, Bk. II, chap. 5, §§ 30–33: “Dionysius tamen Areopagita, vir celestis, lumen ex tribus cereis unum eam similitudinem reddere sufficienter ut in creaturis, presertim his inferioribus, existimat. Nam et unum est sine divisione et tria, et totum cuiusvis cerei lumen in toto ceterorum est absque confusione. Si enim unum removeris cereum, lumen quoque suum distinctissime sequetur. Hec similitudo mihi satis in hac vita facere videtur ut intelligamus deum vere unum subsistere et suppositorum quodlibet similiter. Nam lumen totum simul indistincte et cuiuslibet cerei lumen inconfuse subsistere videtur, quod separatio ac remotio unius cerei, ut diximus, ostendit. Mixtio tamen quedam fieri videtur quando simul totum lumen est, et disseparatio eius quod removetur, que longe a divinis extirminanda sunt. Sed non possunt singula singulis ad unguem convenire. Quare que ad rem pertinent, sola intelligendi gratia sunt a vestigiis summenda; et que sumuntur, altius et divine maiestati convenienter intelligenda. Infinite enim creator creaturas excedit.”

33 *Comparatio*, Bk. II, chap. 5, § 34: “Ex his omnibus aliisque similibus facile ipse inducor, ut credam, nullum expressius nobis vestigium inveniri posse quam sit hec corporis similitudo. Unum enim et tria est, et tria ordinem habent, et ordinem qui in deo uno et trino est.”

These are thus the facts of the matter, as we have said and as has been succinctly argued by Aristotle. "The magnitude," he says [in Bk. 1 of the *De Caelo*], "which is in fact in one thing is a line, that in two is a surface, that in three is a body, and besides these there is no other magnitude because the three are all that there are." And a little later: "For the last, the middle, and the beginning have the number of the whole universe." He is showing here that the last is from the first and the middle, and the middle is from the first, which he calls the beginning because from it and the second is the third; but the second is from it alone, and the third is from it through the middle, which, in order to show this, he called not the second but the middle. Also, he named the third not the third, but the last in order to signify that a stop is made there and that there cannot be any further emanations to proceed on to. For no magnitude flows from depth; nor is there a transit into another genus, he says, but only from length into surface and from these into body. Furthermore, after he said, "for the last, the middle, and the beginning have the number of the whole universe," he immediately added: "this is in fact the number of trinity itself." But three things that have no relation between themselves besides a sequence of number, are not a trinity nor can be called a trinity since they are not such. For a trinity signifies an essential sequence, that is to say, a sequence of co-numbered things. But the facts themselves proclaim that a body is such by nature, and no one will deny that Aristotle understood the nature of body. ...

Consequently, it now remains to show that this likeness was applied by Aristotle to God and, in fact, to show this in his own words. "The last," he says, "the middle, and the beginning have the number of the whole universe." Indeed, these, namely, the beginning, middle, and last, "are of the trinity," saying here "of the trinity itself." For in Greek the word is written with the article, which cannot be translated any other way in Latin [than "of the trinity itself"]. Why therefore did he say "of the trinity itself" so expressly and distinctly? No cause can be found unless you refer to God. For we customarily speak that way when we wish to signify something singular. Moreover, you will not in fact easily be able to imagine another singular trinity. But although this passage alone can satisfy me and right thinking persons devoted to the Trinity that is the creator of all, he, nonetheless, added there something more obvious and, indeed, something no one save a madman would contradict (for what follows is nothing other than an application). "For this reason," he says, "since we have accepted it from nature as if it were law, we also use this number in the ceremonies of the gods and we fit our appellations [to it] in this way. For we in fact say 'the two both' and 'both twos' and 'either two,' but we do not say 'all two.' But we employ this appellation ['all'] first about 'threes' because, as has been said, we are following the way we have been instructed by nature to follow." Aristotle says therefore that men were instructed by the laws of nature to use the number of the trinity in the ceremonies and sacrifices of the gods. What does this have to do with his thesis? Even if it had not the slightest relevance for his thesis, what does it mean? Impelled by nature, he says, men use the number of the trinity in sacrifices to the gods. Nature certainly does nothing in vain. Why, therefore, does it impel men to use the number of the trinity in the ceremonies of the gods or why more in the ceremonies of the gods than in other things? Turn the matter around in your mind however you might and you will discover that it was said by Aristotle for no other reason than because, inasmuch as nature does nothing in vain, he believed that through nature all men were led to use the number of the trinity in sacrifices to the gods. He wanted to show that the number of the trinity was in god just as it was in a body. This is why, after he had said that these three, i. e., the beginning, middle, and last, are to be found with this relationship in a certain singular trinity, he immediately added: for this reason, nature,

which does nothing in vain, impelled me to use the number of the trinity in the ceremonies of the gods.³⁴

Now, in *Summa Theologiae*, Prima pars, quaestio 12, articulus 2, Thomas Aquinas answered negatively the question “Utrum essentia dei ab intellectu creato per aliquam similitudinem videatur”, and therefore opposed the exemplarism espoused by St. Bonaventure and his school.³⁵ Indeed, in his commentary on the Sentences, Bk. 1, distinction 3, q. 1, he explicitly quotes this passage from the *De Caelo* in order to reject it as a suggestion of trinitarianism: “Respondeo dicendum, quod per naturalem rationem non potest perveniri in cognitionem Trinitatis personarum; et ideo philosophi nihil de hoc sciverunt, nisi forte per revelationem vel auditum ab aliis.” So, not sur-

³⁴ *Comparatio*, Bk. II, chap. 5, §§ 41–45 (= end of chap. 5); chap. 6, §§ 1–8: “Sic se habent sicut et nos diximus et ab Aristotele perstringuntur. ‘Magnitudo,’ inquit, ‘que quidem in uno linea, que vero in duabus superficies, que in tribus corpus, et preter has non est alia magnitudo quia tres omnes sunt.’ Et paulo post: ‘Ultimum enim, medium, et principium totius universi numerum habent.’ Hinc ostendit ultimum ex primo et medio esse et medium ex primo, quod principium appellat quia ex eo et secundo et tertium est, sed secundum ex eo solum, tertium ex eo per medium, quod, ut ostenderet, non secundum, sed medium nominavit. Tertium quoque non tertium, sed ultimum nuncupavit ut significaret statum ibi fieri nec ulterius emanationes progredi posse. Nulla enim ex profunditate profluit magnitudo; nec est transitus in aliud genus, inquit, sed solum ex longitudine in superficiem et in corpus ex ipsis. Preterea, cum dixisset, ‘ultimum enim, medium, et principium totius universi numerum habent,’ statim addidit, ‘hec vero ipsa trinitatis ipsius.’ At tria que nullum inter se habent preter numeri ordinem trinitas non sunt nec dici trinitas possunt quia non sunt. Trinitas enim essentialis, id est, ipsarum rerum connumeratorum, ordinem significat. Sed corpus eiusmodi natura esse res ipsa predicit, naturamque corporis Aristotelem vidiisse nemo negabitur. ... Quare nunc restat deo similitudinem hanc accommodari ab ipso et quidem verbis eius ostendere. ‘Ultimum,’ inquit, ‘medium, et principium totius universi numerum habent. Hec vero ipsa,’ principium, scilicet, medium, et ultimum, ‘trinitatis,’ cuius ‘trinitatis ipsius’ inquit. Cum articulo enim Grece scribitur, quod Latine aliter traduci non potest. Cur ergo sic expresse insigniteque ‘trinitatis ipsius’ dixerit? Nulla potest inveniri causa nisi ad deum referas. Solemus enim ita loqui quando singulare aliquid significare volumus. Quam porro aliam singularem voluerit trinitatem referre ne fingere quidem facile poteris. Verum quamquam mihi et recte intelligentibus creatrice omnium trinitati affectis id solum satisfacere potest, ipse tamen apertius quiddam, et quidem cui nemo non insanus contradiceret, illico addidit (nam quod sequitur nihil aliud quam accommodatio est): ‘Ideo,’ inquit, ‘cum a natura quasi leges acceperimus, et ad ceremonias deorum hoc numero utimur, et appellations hoc pacto accommodamus. Duo enim ambo quidem dicimus, et duos ambos atque utrosque, omnes vero non dicimus. Sed hanc appellationem de tribus primum dicimus, quod, ut dictum est, sequimur quia sic a natura sumus instituti.’ Primum igitur nature legibus institutos homines in ceremoniis sacrificiisque deorum trinitatis numero usos fuisse ait. Quid hoc ad propositum? Etsi ad propositum minime pertinet, quid sibi vult? Natura, inquit, impulsi homines trinitatis numero in sacrificiis deorum utuntur. Natura certe nihil facit frustra. Cur ergo impellebat homines trinitatis numero in deorum ceremoniis uti, aut cur in deorum ceremoniis magis quam in aliis rebus? Verte rem quocumque volueris, invenies non alia ratione id ab Aristotele dictum esse nisi quia, cum natura nihil faciat frustra, eo omnes homines per ipsam duci crederet, ut trinitatis numero in deorum sacrificiis uterentur.”

³⁵ See Speer 2003, 237.

prisingly, in his commentary on the relevant passage in the *De Caelo*, Bk. 1, lectio 2, Thomas saw absolutely no sign or suggestion of trinitarian belief. Since George usually wrote extensive glosses to his translation, though none survive for his translation of the *De Caelo*,³⁶ it is not improbable that he consulted Thomas' commentary on the work, just as it is more than likely that he had read the *Prima Pars* of the *Summa Theologiae* as well as the *Summa contra Gentiles*, both of which were favorites of theologically inclined Quattrocento humanists. In any case, George's exemplarism stands in stark opposition to the views of Thomas Aquinas. I do not think his exemplarism was inspired by a reading of St. Bonaventure, whom he never mentions anywhere. Rather, his exemplarism reflects his admiration of pseudo-Dionysius and his desire to prove Aristotle's compatibility with Christianity.

The one controversial major point upon which George and Thomas agreed was on the eternity of the world. Against the Franciscan tradition,³⁷ Thomas had argued in the *Prima Pars*, q. 46 of the *Summa Theologiae* and in *De Aeternitate Mundi* that creation in time cannot be demonstrated. Here is George's reading of Aristotle on creation:

According to Aristotle the world is perpetual, and so are all creatures, either individually, such as the sun, the moon, and all other things of this sort, or by virtue of their species, as is the case for all corruptible things. The relationship of the perpetual to the eternal is in fact such that the eternal is all at once and immobile both essentially and accidentally (for it is subject to no motion) while the perpetual is itself a motion or is subject to a motion either essentially or accidentally or may be in motion or is capable of being moved, or, at least, it is measured by motion or by the measure of motion, i. e., by time. In truth, Aristotle seems to have posited no middle term between the eternal and the perpetual. I say this because I see some later authors positing the *aevum* between the two [a statement which proves that George had been reading Scholastic authors on the subject of time]. But this is besides the point. The world, therefore, is perpetual, as Aristotle says. Hence, there never was a time when it was not, and time always was and always will be ... All other philosophers, while in fact considering the heavens and earth to be made, think that time did not preexist them, indeed, that time always was, and that the world was made in time from matter. "For," as Aristotle says in chapter 9, Bk. 1 of *On the Heavens*, "everyone says that the world was made." The world therefore is perpetual, that is to say, it always was and always will be. And, nonetheless, Aristotle believes that it is dependent upon the will of God, that is to say, it so exists by the will of God that that the reason it exists is because God wants it to exist, and if you were to take away the will of God, at that very instant you will have reduced the world to nothing. Consequently, it does not seem possible to conceive naturally of a reason why the world is not perpetual when God's goodness is eternal and his will immutable. ... It is also obvious that we cannot say that according to Aristotle the world is created or produced by God, but just that it is always being produced and created. For what is always dependent upon God is always being produced and created. This is true because God is pure act and therefore omnipotent not extensively, but intensively. He would be extensively omnipotent if he acted only in time. ... God assuredly does not act in time, but in a moment not of time, ... but, as I have said, of eternity. ... [I]t also follows that the world neither is nor was made. For these words signify that the world is made from matter. The world in fact is not made from matter according to Aristotle because

³⁶ For George's Aristotelian scholia see Monfasani 1984, 603–666.

³⁷ See Houser 2013; Etzkorn 2003, 386; and Putallaz 2003, 516.

neither is it made in time. For what is made from matter is made in time. ... For the heavens were so produced as to be produced neither previous to nor later than time, but together with time. For it is simultaneously that the heavens and the motion of the heavens exist and do not exist. Thus, if I might briefly recapitulate, Aristotle's opinion therefore is that the world is produced by God and always is all at once so dependent upon God that indeed not even prime matter preexists it either in fact or in reason or in nature or in any way whatsoever. Also, the world is produced by and is dependent upon the free will of God, and is perpetual and ungenerable because it has no principle in time, and is incorruptible because it will have not a terminus in time. Compare these statements with Catholic truth. They do not differ except on one point. For through Revelation Catholic truth renders us an account of the origin of the world, namely, that it was not made in time, but was produced together with time and matter *ex nihilo*.³⁸

From the form of his argument, it is clear that George agreed with Thomas not because he took sides in Thomas' debate with the Franciscan tradition, but because he was anxious to square Aristotle's obvious assertion of the eternity of the world with the Christian belief in eternity. His solution was to bracket created time, which is an extended infinity within divine eternity which is an intense infinity, a *simul totum*, and therefore an infinity of a totally different order.

In sum, in the five issues we have surveyed, the hylomorphism of souls, spiritual matter, the plurality of forms, exemplarism, and the eternity of the world, we see that George took positions contrary to Thomas Aquinas on all but the last. Consequently, we must take his expressions of admiration for Thomas and the Dominican tradition not as avowals of special loyalty, but as particularized instances of his admiration of Latin Scholasticism in general, wherein Thomas and the Dominicans played conspicuous roles. George's disagreement with Thomas arose from his own independent

³⁸ *Comparatio*, Bk. II, chap. 11, §§ 4–28: “Perpetuum igitur mundum, hoc est, semper fuisse semperque futurum, et tamen a voluntate dei dependere Aristoteles censet, idest, ita esse a voluntate dei ut ideo sit, quia deus vult, et si voluntatem dei subtraxeris, mundum illico ad nihil reduxeris. Hac etiam de causa non videtur posse naturaliter ratio excogitari quare, cum bonitas dei eterna sit et voluntas immutabilis, mundus perpetuus non sit ... Illud etiam patet, non posse nos secundum Aristotelem dicere creatum sive productum esse mundum a deo, sed produci semper atque creari. Nam quod a deo semper dependet, id ab eo semper producitur atque creatur. Quod ideo verum est, quoniam deus actus purus est et propterea omnipotens non extensive, sed intensive. Extensive omnipotens esset si non nisi in tempore operaretur ... Deus vero non in tempore agitur, sed in momento non temporis, ... sed, ut sic dixerim, eternitatis ... Unde etiam sequitur factum mundum non esse neque fieri. Hec enim verba ex materia significant. Mundus vero non est ex materia secundum ipsum quia neque in tempore. Nam que ex materia fiunt, in tempore fiunt ... Celum enim ita producitur ut nec prius tempore producatur neque posterius, sed simul cum tempore. Simul enim sunt et non sunt celum et motus eius ... Hec ergo, ut brevius repetamus, Aristotelis sententia est, mundum a deo produci et ab eo semper dependere totum simul ita ut ne materia quidem prima prefuerit, nec re nec ratione sive natura nec quovis pacto; et produci ac dependere a voluntate dei libera, et esse perpetuum ac ingenerabilem quia nullum principium temporis habeat, et incorruptibilem quia nullum temporis terminum habebit. Conferas hec veritati Catholice. Non discrepant nisi in uno. Veritas enim Catholica principium mundi per revelationem nobis reddit, non quod in tempore factus sit aut ex materia, sed quod una cum tempore et simul cum materia sua productus ex nihilo.”

reading of Aristotle. It was purely happenstance that these positions tended to accord with those of Franciscan authors. There is no evidence that he read these Franciscan authors or was even aware that he was taking sides in the debates between the Dominicans and Franciscans. George was not a Scholastic, but a Greek humanist and amateur philosopher. Unlike the Byzantine Thomists, his admiration for Thomas arose not from reading Demetrius Cydones' translations of Thomas. He came to Italy too young and ill educated to have formed any firm philosophical positions. Indeed, he tells us that he first read Plato's *Gorgias* for the first time in Italy,³⁹ and the same was probably true for his reading of most of the writings of Plato and Aristotle. George was a Greek who first encountered Latin Scholasticism in Italy and in Latin. In other words, George had never been a Byzantine Thomist, but was rather a Greek émigré who enthusiastically embraced the philosophical and theological traditions of his new home. He was not a Byzantine Aristotelian nor a Byzantine Thomist, but a Latin Aristotelian with a knowledge of Greek, a knowledge that entitled him, he believed, to contribute to the tradition of Latin Scholasticism. Unlike his practice when writing on rhetoric, where he introduced Greek sources into the Latin tradition,⁴⁰ in philosophy George embraced the Latin tradition in opposition to much of what he viewed as the Greek tradition. So, in his own peculiar way, East and West did meet in George of Trebizond.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

F. Filelfo, *On Exile*, ed. J. De Keyser, engl. tr. by W. S. Blanchard, Cambridge, Mass. 2013 [Filelfo, *On Exile*]

C. Salutati, *De Fato et Fortuna*, ed. C. Bianca, Florence 1985 [Salutati, *De Fato et Fortuna*]

Thomas Aquinas, *Opuscula Philosophica*, ed. R. M. Spiazzi, Rome, 1954

G. Trapezuntius, *Comparationes Phylosophorum Aristotelis et Platonis*, Venice: Iacobus Pentius de Leuco, 1523; photographically reproduced Frankfurt a. M. 1965 [Trapezuntius, *Comparationes*]

G. Trapezuntius, *Rheticorum libri quinque*, ed. L. Deitz, Hildesheim/Zürich/New York 2006 (= photographic reproduction of the Paris: Christian Wechel, 1538 edition) [Trapezuntius, *Rheticorum libri*]

³⁹ See Monfasani 1976, 6, 12–13; *Comparatio*, Bk. III, chap. 6, § 6: “Cum in Italianam adolescens venissem, apud Victorinum Feltrensem, virum et doctrina et vite integratitatem singularem, prima Latine lingue rudimenta percepi, illeque a me vicissim Grecam linguam, quantum afferre poteram, exhauebat. Tunc primum Platonis *Gorgias* mihi lectus et a me illi expositus est. Tunc Platonicorum morum scelerata percepit. Tunc qui non odit Platonem, eum bonorum omnium hostem esse cognovi.”

⁴⁰ See nn. 1 and 11 above.

Secondary Sources

Aertsen, J. A. and A. Speer, eds. (1996). *Individuum und Individualität im Mittelalter*. Berlin.

Barbalarga, D. (1984). "Un documento inedito su Giorgio da Trebisonda: La donazione di tre sue opere al convento della Minerva di Roma". In: *Pluteus* 2, pp. 159–162.

Callus, D. (1955). *The Condemnation of St Thomas at Oxford*. 2nd ed. London.

Classen, C. J. (1993). "The Rhetorical Works of George of Trebizond and Their Debt to Cicero". In: *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 56, pp. 75–84.

Collins, A. B. (1974). *The Secular is Sacred: Platonism and Thomism in Marsilio Ficino's Platonic Theology*. The Hague.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. "§ 1. Die Hesychastenstreit (Manuel Kalekas). (Demetrios Kydones). (Prochoros Kydones). (Georgios Scholarios – Gennadios II)". In: *Grundiss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Begründet von F. Überweg. Die Philosophie des Mittelalters. Band 1/1: Jüdische und byzantinische Philosophie. Bandteil: Byzantinische Philosophie*. Ed. by G. Kariev. Forthcoming. Chap. 8.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2002c). "Georgios Gennadios II-Scholarios' *Florilegium Thomisticum*: His Early Abridgment of Various Chapters and Quaestiones of Thomas Aquinas' *Summae* and His Anti-Plethonism". In: *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales* 69, pp. 117–171.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2006b). "Georgios Gemistos-Plethon's Dependence on Thomas Aquinas' *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Summa Theologiae*". In: *Archiv für mittelalterliche Philosophie und Kultur* 12, pp. 276–341.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2007b). "Georgios Gennadios II-Scholarios' *Florilegium Thomisticum I (De Fato)* and its anti-Plethonic Tenor". In: *Forschungen zur Theologie und Philosophie des Mittelalters* 74.2, pp. 301–376.

Etzkorn, G. J. (2003). "John Pecham". In: *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia and T. B. Noone. Oxford, pp. 384–387.

Fyrigos, A. (2004c). "Tomismo e antitomismo a Bizanzio (con una nota sulla *Defensio S. Thomae adversus Nilum Cabasilam* di Demetrio Cidone)". In: *Tommaso d'Aquino († 1274) e il mondo bizantino*. Ed. by A. Molle. Venafro, pp. 27–72.

Ganchou, T. (2008). "Iōannès Argyropoulos, Gēōrgios Trapézountios et le patron crétois Gēōgios Maurikas". In: *Thesaurismata* 38, pp. 105–212.

Garfagnini, G. C. (1997). "Paolo Cortesi e i *Libri IV Sententiarum*: una rilettura umanistica di un 'classico medievale'". In: *Medioevo e Rinascimento*, (n. s.) 11, pp. 97–123.

Gracia, J. J. E. and T. B. Noone, eds. (2003). *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. Oxford.

Hackett, J. (2003). "Roger Bacon". In: *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia and T. B. Noone. Oxford, pp. 616–625.

Haldane, J. (2010). "Soul and Body". In: *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*. Ed. by R. Pasnau. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Cambridge, pp. 293–304.

Hoenen, M. J. F. M. (1996). "'Aliter autem dicunt Thomistae': Das Prinzip der Individuation in der Auseinandersetzung zwischen den Albertisten, Thomisten und Scotisten des ausgehenden Mittelalters". In: *Individuum und Individualität im Mittelalter*. Ed. by J. A. Aertsen and A. Speer. Berlin, pp. 338–345.

Houser, R. E. (2013). "Saint Bonaventure, 3.2. 'Creation'". In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. First published Tue Nov 1, 2005; substantive revision Wed Feb 27, 2013. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/bonaventure/>.

King, P. O. (1994). "Bonaventure". In: *Individuation in Scholasticism: The Later Middle Ages and the Counter Reformation*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia. Albany, NY, pp. 141–172.

Kristeller, P. O. (1985). "Pier Candido Decembrio and His Unpublished Treatise on the Immortality of the Soul". In: *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*. Vol. 2. Rome, pp. 281–300.

Mohler, L. (1923–1942). *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann*. 3 vols. Paderborn.

Monfasani, J. (1976). *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic*. Leiden.

Monfasani, J. (1984). *Collectanea Trapezuntiana: Texts, Documents, and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond*. Binghamton, NY.

Monfasani, J. (1993). “The Averroism of John Argyropoulos and His *Quaestio utrum intellectus humanus sit perpetuus*”. In: *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance* 5. Reprinted as Essay II in J. Monfasani, *Greeks and Latins in Renaissance Italy: Studies on Humanism and Philosophy in the 15th Century*, Aldershot 2004, pp. 157–208.

Pasnau, R. and J. Toivanen (2013). “Peter John Olivi”. In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. First published Tue Nov 2, 1999; substantive revision Mon Apr 15, 2013. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/olivi/>.

Pessin, S. (2010). “Solomon Ibn Gabirol [Avicembron]”. In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. First published Thu Sep 23, 2010. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ibn-gabirol/>.

Podskalsky, G. (1974c). “Die Rezeption der thomistischen Theologie bei Gennadios II. Scholarios (ca. 1403–1472)”. In: *Theologie und Philosophie* 49, pp. 305–323.

Podskalsky, G. (1977d). *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz: Die Streit um die theologische Methodik in der spätbyzantinischen Geistesgeschichte (14./15. Jh.), seine systematischen Grundlagen und seine historische Entwicklung*. Munich.

Putallaz, F.-X. (2003). “Peter Olivi”. In: *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia and T. B. Noone. Oxford, pp. 516–523.

Spade, P. V. (2008). “Binarium Famosissimum”. In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. First published Mon Jul 14, 2003; substantive revision Mon Jun 16, 2008. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/binarium/>.

Speer, A. (2003). “Bonaventure”. In: *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia and T. B. Noone. Oxford, pp. 233–240.

Wood, R. (1996). “Angelic Individuation according to Richard Rufus, St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas Aquinas”. In: *Individuum und Individualität im Mittelalter*. Ed. by J. A. Aertsen and A. Speer, pp. 209–229.

Zavalloni, R. (1951). *Richard de Mediavilla et la controverse sur la pluralité des formes*. Louvain.

Antoine Levy

Translatable and Untranslatable Aquinas

The soft cosmological revolution of scholasticism's golden age and the rejection of Aquinas by the first Palamite circles

We all sense that the art of translation is a thoroughly paradoxical exercise. I believe F. Schlegel nailed something of this paradoxical nature when, as yet a college student, he wrote in one of his notebooks: "The best is precisely what gets lost in typically good or excellent translations".¹ To put it much less elegantly: In order to convey the meaning of the original text, a translator must in some manner hide or veil the way it is worded in the source-language by forging an equivalent set of expressions in the target-language. Conversely, there is no better way to manifest the genius of the original text than the failure to find an adequate set of expressions that can replace it. Now imagine that one does what no one usually bothers to do when the original version is still at hand. Think of someone who completed the retroversion of an excellent translation and gave it to read to those who are well acquainted with the original version. Let us take for example a German brought up on Goethe's *Faust* who is then asked to go through a German translation of Nerval's wonderful French translation of the play. I am not sure whether this reader would like what he finds, but one thing is sure: he will find the retroversion to be utterly different from the original masterpiece. *Mutatis mutandis*, I think there is something very similar going on in the existentially dramatic but theologically fascinating Byzantine *Rezeptionsgeschichte* of Demetrios Kydones' translations of Thomas Aquinas. Kydones' works as well as the ensuing dogmatic-political fight both bear witness to the fact that he fervently believed his translations to be an act of theological retroversion. He was intent on giving back to what remained of the waning Byzantine literary elite an understanding of its own theological tradition that he claimed to have found nowhere else than in the writings of this Latin theologian called Aquinas. This new reading of the Greek Fathers through lenses borrowed from the Latin world directly challenged the reading of the Greek Fathers that was simultaneously promoted by the disciples of Gregory Palamas, a reading that claimed to draw on these common sources according to their original text. We are here looking at the origin of a way of thinking that is now widely believed to be constitutive of modern Orthodox identity, while it has also been feeding Western prejudices against the Orthodox world ever since. This way of thinking rests on the assumption that there is

¹ "Was in gewöhnlichen guten oder vortrefflichen Übersetzungen verloren geht, ist grade das Beste", *Athenäums-Fragmente: und andere Schriften*, frag. 73, p. 13.

a fundamental, dogmatic incompatibility between Aquinas and Palamas, the former being accused of ratiocinating in some sort of lame Aristotelian way by neo-Palamites, the latter of platonizing in a manner bordering on heresy by neo-Thomists.

Here I would like to question the reality of this incompatibility. What if this were but a mere *impression* of dogmatic incompatibility, the by-product of Aquinas' own previous transposition into the theological language of the West of the Greek sources referred to by Palamas? As an excellent translation, that is, a translation as faithful as possible to the meaning of its model, Aquinas' interpretation of the Greek Fathers in Latin theological language would still be conceived to be shockingly far from their source once it was transferred back into the language in which these Fathers expressed their views.

There seem to be a number of hurdles on the way to establishing the truth of this hypothesis. I see at least three which pertain to the various stages of the proposed process of translation and retroversion. In the first place, what was the reason for what I call this Latin theological translation of the Greek Fathers? Secondly, how did it happen? How can we describe the nature of this translation? Thirdly, how did the retroversion of this Latin translation into Greek generate the impression that its content was directly opposed to that of the genuine Greek tradition? I will tackle these three questions in a logical rather than chronological order. Following Aristotle's recommendation to proceed from the known or better known to the lesser known, I will start with the last stage, which concerns the debate sparked in Byzantium by Kydones' translation of Aquinas. I will then shift back to the Western world and examine the interaction between the tradition of the Greek Fathers and Latin theology at the beginning of the thirteenth century. Finally I will describe what I call the soft intellectual revolution led by the great Latin thinkers of the thirteenth century, especially by Aquinas.

1 Anti-Palamite use of Kydones' translation

As is well-known, the Palamite party did not have to wait for Demetrios' translation to encounter fierce opposition in Byzantium. Barlaam of Calabria had launched the hostilities against Palamas' distinction between essence and energies already in the 1330s. Gregory Akyndinos and Nikephoros Gregoras, who opposed the Palamite party during the following decade, were also advocates of the authentic legacy of the Fathers, threatened by the Palamite *kainotomiai* on the one side and by the deviant doctrines of the Latins on the other. Thus, far from initiating the debate with the Palamite party, the Byzantine reading of Aquinas was destined to be infected by the ongoing controversy. True, I find it difficult to believe that Demetrios' admiration for Aquinas came out of his detestation of the bearded and unsophisticated counsellors that had supplanted him in the favour of *basileus* John Kantakuzenos. But it was most certainly his admiration for Aquinas that drove him, together with his brother and a few follow-

ers, into the midst of the controversy. Indeed, there was no trace in Aquinas' writings of divine *energeiai* which, while being uncreated, should nonetheless be conceived as really distinct from God's uncreated essence. It fell upon Prochoros Kydones, working in close tandem with his brother, to formulate an anti-Palamite stance on the basis of Aquinas' views. In this small treatise which is part of a larger one that went under the name of *De Essentia et Operatione*, Prochoros adopted the argumentative structure of Aquinas' *Quaestiones Disputatae*.² At the same time, he showed himself wary of relying on authorities from the Latin tradition, with the exception of St. Augustine. Knowing that these would have little impact on his adversaries, Prochoros tackled the very authorities that Palamites were accustomed to invoke: the Cappadocians, John Chrysostom, Dionysius the Areopagite, Maximus the Confessor, John Damascene, etc. It is on these common exegetical grounds that Prochoros endeavoured to establish the doctrinal and traditional priority of the concept of created grace – and accordingly the soundness of Aquinas' theological views. Nonetheless I hold that any unbiased disciple of Aquinas cannot but notice that Prochoros' anti-Palamite use of the notion of created grace falls short of a genuinely Thomistic metaphysics of participation. According to Prochoros, the light seen by the disciples at the Transfiguration, just as any other supernatural manifestation of God, is a symbolic sign or impression that is merely an *analogon* in the created order of God's uncreated nature.³ As Prochoros argues, the infinite distance between the uncreated and the created prevents the disciples from contemplating God's uncreated light at the Transfiguration.

But Aquinas never speaks of grace as a created symbol because grace is not *what* the saints see. Indeed, grace is that created quality through which, *quo* and *sub quo*, the saints are enabled to see God's uncreated truth as it raises human intellectual faculties high above the power they possess according to their nature. Grace is the consequence of a supernatural influx that opens the human mind to the perception of the uncreated as an object of faith and ultimately, as an object of vision when transformed into the *lumen gloriae*.⁴ Prochoros' account of the transfiguration overlooks all this. In actual fact it is not difficult to show that the thinker behind Prochoros' considerations is not Aquinas but the anti-Latin as well as anti-Palamite Gregory Akyndinos. For example, in one passage of his letters, Akyndinos speaks of the bright apparitions of angels in these terms: "by forms [Athanasius] means the different forms [the angels] at different times symbolically see [...] And [Gregory of Nazianz] says: Brilliance and joy are a characteristic of the angels whenever they receive a bodily form (ὅταν τυπῶνται

² This part was edited, translated and published by M. Candal separately from the rest of the treatise, erroneously ascribed to Akyndinos by Migne; Candal 1954.

³ Candal 1954, par. 12, p. 272: "[...] θεοφάνεια δὲ γεγόνασι τοῖς ἀγίοις κατά τάς πρεπούσας Θεῷ διά τινων ἱερῶν καὶ τοῖς ὄρωσιν ἀναλόγων ὄράσων" "to [the faculties of] the viewers" (my translation).

⁴ See *In Sent.* III, d. 24, q. 1, a. 1, qc. 1, arg. 1, ed. M. F. Moos, Paris 1956 (for *veritas increata*); *ST* IIa IIae, q. 2, a. 2, co. (for *veritas prima*); Ia, q. 12, a. 2, co.; a. 5, ad 3, a. 6, co. (for *lumen gloriae*), ed. Collège Dominicain d'Ottawa, Ottawa 1941–1945.

σωματικῶς); they are a symbol of their purity". This leads Akyndinos to conclude that the object of man's supernatural experience is essentially distinct from the uncreated light that is God: "if the soul and the angel which are created beings are symbolically perceived because they cannot be apprehended in themselves by the bodily eyes, how can the divine and uncreated form and glory of God be apprehended and seen in itself [...]?"⁵

I take it as a fact that the excellent translations of Aquinas by Demetrios were artificially turned into a rather lame, anti-Palamite weapon by his own circle – and by himself to a lesser extent. But showing that the doctrine of Aquinas is not necessarily exclusive of Palamas is one thing. Proving that both doctrines fundamentally coincide is another. What we need to do is establish that the doctrine of Aquinas is to some extent an exact transposition in Latin terms of the Greek tradition of which Palamas happens to be a faithful representative. This is *a priori* a difficult challenge. Has it not been the steady line of Catholic theology since the Council of Florence to claim that the doctrine adduced/proposed by Palamas was entirely foreign to the tradition of the Church? It suffices to mention the works of M. Jugie on this issue. Still, a few voices have dared – already some time ago – to set this apparent consensus into question. As we examine one of them in particular, we turn now to the Latin pre-history of the Byzantine controversy.

2 The condemnations of 1241 and the Greek Fathers – more than an avatar

When M.-D. Chenu published an article entitled "Le dernier avatar de la théologie orientale au XIIIe siècle", I doubt that he fully realised the groundbreaking character of his contribution.⁶ As for its core insight, it flowed quite naturally out of a general reappraisal among French Church historians of the influence of the Greek Fathers on the development of Latin twelfth-century spirituality and theology. There was indeed nothing exceptional in associating the Greek Fathers' agnosticism with the first of the propositions condemned by the Masters of the Paris Faculty of Theology in 1241, namely "that the divine essence will neither be seen by men nor by angels (quod divina essentia in se nec ab homine nec ab angelo videbitur)". But Chenu's analysis of the seventh proposition "that there are a number of eternal truths which are not God (quod multe veritates sunt ab aeterno quae non sunt Deus)" was much bolder. Let me quote the passage:

⁵ Akyndinos, *Letters*, A. C. Hero (editor), Washington D.C. 1983, 161 (par. 180–185).

⁶ Chenu 1947.

C'est la nécessité de fonder doctrinalement l'union avec Dieu qui amena Basile, Grégoire et Denys à reconnaître en ce Dieu inaccessible des "énergies" *incrées* qui nous le révèlent et nous le rendront *participable*. À l'essence *inconnaissable* répond la voie négative, aux énergies *révélatrices* répond la théologie positive. Maxime et Damascène, maintenant traduits, acclament confusément cette obscure interprétation d'une "économie" de la vie divine connue dans ses rapports avec l'être créé, procession manifestatrice *inseparable de l'essence, tout en étant ineffablement distincte*.⁷

Western historians have traditionally understood the first and seventh condemnations as reflecting the influence of Eriugena's *Perifision*. They had in mind his elaborations on the notion of theophany and his theory about the *natura creata et creans* that proceeds from the *natura creans et non creata*. There is little doubt about that or about the fact that Eriugena was heavily indebted to the Greek Fathers in this respect. But do the condemned propositions reflect the original thinking of the Fathers or some misleading Eriugenian/Eriugenist interpretations? What we need to understand in the first place are the reasons that may explain the resurgence of a disreputable doctrine going back to the ninth century at the Paris Faculty of Theology around the middle of the thirteenth century.

Relying on accounts written in the second half of the thirteenth century, historians have generally, in this regard, referred to the pantheistic heresies that arose at the beginning of the same century, mainly the ideas of Amalric of Bena.⁸ However modern research has almost unanimously established that those accusations of Eriugenerism were the effect of a biased or confused reconstruction.⁹ On the contrary, it appears that those who promoted a new reading of the *Perifision* in the light of the recent translations of the Greek Fathers were their direct or indirect opponents. These were learned Cistercians like Garnier of Rochefort or Helinand of Froimond.¹⁰ But there were also disciples of Gilbert of Porret, such as Alain of Lille, Raoul Ardent and Simon

⁷ Chenu 1947, 171–172 (emphasis is mine).

⁸ Amaury's followers were burnt at the stake in 1210. Alberic of Three Fountains and Martin of Tropau, two authors of the second half of the 13th century, associate Amalric's teaching with that of the *Perifision*, see *Contra Amaurianos* P. Lucentini editor, Leuven 2010, 83–84, 89–90.

⁹ See Capelle 1932; D'Alverny 1950–1951; *Contra Amaurianos*, introduction. col. 1311–1334.

¹⁰ There is little doubt that Garnier was the author of the *Contra Amaurianos* recently edited by P. Lucentini. If Amalric's teaching that God was the being of all things could draw on a couple of passages from Dionysius' treatises, referring these passages to their original contexts as featuring the causal and sanctifying processions originating from a wholly transcendent God was still the best manner to discard Amalric's grossly pantheistic interpretation of Dionysius. Another treatise, the *Commentary on Dionysius' Celestial Hierarchy* written by William of Lucca in the second half of the twelfth century, is enlightening in that regard, see *Guilelmus Lucensis Comentum in tertiam ierarchiam Dionisi que est de divinis nominibus*, F. Gastaldelli (editor), Firenze 1983. The manuscript is preserved in the library of the Citeaux monastery. It is none other than Garnier of Rochefort who had William's *Commentary* brought it from Italy. William was a disciple of Gilbert of Porret who taught that "[...] in theologica, divina essentia quod de Deo praedicamus cum dicimus Deus est, omnium creatorum dicitur esse" ("[...] in the sphere of theology, the divine essence that we ascribe to God when we say that He is, is the being of

of Tournai.¹¹ But what then of the connection between these theologians and the condemnations of 1241? Here we need to mention a further element.

In actual fact, the thirties and forties of the thirteenth century saw the growing impact on Latin thinking of the Aristotelian *Falsafa* due, among other factors, to the discovery of Avicenna. There one could read of a series of processions from the First Separated Substance that would result in the production of the material world. Moreover, one could find in a number of Arabic writings of the time the denial of the possibility for created intellects to directly contemplate the highest substances emanating from the supreme One. The doctrinal similarities between the Hellenic-Eriugenan

all created things”), see Gilbertus Porretanus, *Super Boethii de hebdomadibus*, PL 64, 1318a, col. 1311–1334. As his master, William refers to the causality of God’s *esse*, distinguished from the *esse aliquid* of created things, to explain the essential co-inherence of God in the world when he tackles Dionysius’ expressions on God as “esse omnium” (“[...] τὸ γὰρ εἶναι πάντων ἐστὶν ἡ ὑπὲρ τὸ εἶναι θεότης” *De Coelesti Hierarchia*, c. 4, s. 1, G. Heil and A. M. Ritter (editors), Berlin 1991, p. 21, l. 16; see equally *De divinis nominibus*, c. 5, s. 4: “[...] αὐτός ἐστι τὸ εἶναι τοῖς οὖσι καὶ οὐ τὰ ὄντα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι τῶν ὄντων”, B. R. Suchla (editor), Berlin 1990, p. 183, l. 8–9). In William’s treatise, Dionysius’ processions are identified with the means through which not only the co-inherence of the world and God but also the mystical union of the elect to God are achieved. Describing the way in which God fashions the soul of man out of some hidden intelligible *potentia* or *dynamis*, William speaks about God’s intelligible operation “[...] quae Graece dicitur *enargia*” (“[...] that is called *enargia* [sic] in Greek”), William of Lucca, *Guilelmus Lucensis Comentum*, Gastaldelli, p. 220. He evokes “*Dei increata virtus*” by which our “*creata virtus*” comes to be united to God” (p. 7). He writes further: “[...] Besides, since a faculty without operation is idle, the theologian that goes by the name of Dionysius refused to conceive the unitive power through which we are conjoined to God as exercising its power without operation? (*absque opera suam exercere potentiam*); instead he thought that it displays its operating power (*eam operationis energiam exercere*) whenever human beings are immersed in contemplation”, William of Lucca, *Guilelmus Lucensis Comentum*, p. 8, Gastaldelli (my translation). Regarding the divine essence, about which William teaches as any “orthodox” disciple of Gilbert that it is the same as the Godhead (*divinitas*), William professes the very agnosticism that will be condemned in 1241: “The Godhead is hidden (*occulta est divinitas*) since nobody has ever seen God (*Deum nemo vidit umquam*). If nobody has ever seen God when it comes to the place where the Godhead lies concealed (*in occultate divinitatis*), if no reason or intellect, no speech or writ, no essence or science have ever intuited this reality that is concealed and hidden, one should totally give up the idea of reaching it; it should rather be worshipped according to its remoteness and left to Itself than explored thoughtlessly”, p. 9 (my translation). The vision of the Trinity will be accommodated to our limited capacity of understanding through a “*divina temperantia*” resulting in a divine *fulgor* that will lead us to contemplate God through a multiplicity of eternal *claritates* (p. 10–12); on the connection between the Dionysian inspiration and Citeaux see also M.-D. Chenu 1960; I. P. Sheldon-Williams 1977.

¹¹ The attitude of these Cistercians and Porretans contrasted with the diffidence of the main theological schools of the twelfth century, including the Victorins, towards the cosmism of the Greek Fathers. This was highlighted by Vicaire 1937, 475 a number of years ago: “Au contraire, les porrétiens de la fin du siècle, après les théologiens de l’Ecole de Chartres, sont les grands vulgarisateurs de Boèce, de Scot et de Denys et ne restent absolument pas fermés sur eux-mêmes”. Alain de Lille, Raoul Ardent and Simon de Tournai take up Eriugen’s notion of theophania, with its alleged subdivision in epiphanias, hyperphanias, hypopoanias; see H. F. Dondaine 1950. The Cistercians Garnier of Rochefort and Helinand of Froimond do exactly the same, see Jeauneau 1987, 40–44.

tradition cultivated by the Cistercians and this new brand of Aristotelianism struck a chord in the Latin theological world. A treatise like *De Fluxu Entis*, going back to the same period, is witness to this trend, as it features a poorly balanced miscellany of *Falsafa*, Eriugenism and authentic references to the Greek Fathers.¹² It is hardly surprising that, in 1225, the Council of Sens took the decision to destroy all the copies of the *Perifision* extant in Cistercian monasteries. William of Auvergne who fiercely debated against Avicenna and his Latin followers was professor at the Faculty at the time. It is this same William of Auvergne, now Archbishop of Paris, who instigated the trial of 1241.¹³

The most reliable account of the controversy is to be found in Aquinas' *Commentary on the Sentences*, IV, d. 49, q. 2, a. 1, written about ten years later. It points towards an attempt to build a theory of the vision of God on the convergence between the noetics of Avicenna and what Parisian theologians offered as the thought of the Greek Fathers purified from deviant Eriugenism.¹⁴ It is here, as Aquinas' account further reports, that the Parisian devotees of Avicenna came up against a thorny issue. Indeed, according to Christian tradition, the God who is supposed to be contemplated by the elect is more than a separated substance. If, on the one hand, He is infinite and if, on the other, everything that is conceived is conceived according to the mode of the subject who conceives it, how could finite *species*, though supreme and immediately emanating from the first separated substance, ever guarantee the vision of God's essence by the elect? The Parisian *theologi* offered a *determinatio* where they made use of the Greek Fathers in a way that had little to do with a paraphrase of Avicenna. In actual fact, they aligned Avicenna's kataphatism on to the Greek apophatic tradition: Avicenna's supreme *species* became a certain brightness, glory or *fulgor* which, though emanating from God's essence, was different from it as being proportionate to the finiteness of our created minds. The elect would see God directly, since the Glory of God was not ontologically different from Him, but they would not see God ac-

¹² Also called *De Causis Primis et Secundis*, the text was edited and published by R. de Vaux, see de Vaux 1934.

¹³ In his treatise *De Anima* written before 1241, William of Auvergne already denounces the *sequaces* of Aristotle who are tempted to deny the possibility of an immediate vision of God's essence, see H. F. Dondaine 1952, 92–93.

¹⁴ De Contenson 1959, 89 has formerly suggested that these Greek authorities were merely used by the Parisian theologians as doctrinal covers to accredit philosophical theories essentially foreign to the Christian tradition: "L'avicennisme apparaît donc comme la cause immédiate de ce courant et est peut-être aussi, pour une part, le facteur indispensable du succès du courant dionysien à qui il apporte les notations techniques de psychologie qui lui manquaient pour qu'il soit pris au sérieux par les théologiens du XIII^e s. soucieux d'assimiler la science aristotélicienne". I beg to differ in that regard. True, Aquinas presents the noetics of Avicenna as closest to the Christian tradition. But according to the same Aquinas, it was not so in virtue of its agnosticism, but on the contrary because Avicenna favoured, against Alfarabi and Averroes, a direct vision of the supreme separated substances emanating from the One – which by the way seems to be historically correct.

cording to his essence – which implied some sort of distinction, at least on the noetic level, between the divine essence and God's eternal glory. Vindicating M-D. Chenu's insight into the “pre-Palamism” that Parisian theologians read into the Greek Fathers, H. Dondaine has provided extensive textual documentation showing the connection between the *fulgor* theory of 1241 and the writings of the Greek Fathers.¹⁵ The condemnations of 1241 tolled the bell for this whole current.¹⁶ Paradoxically, as I will now show, this failure proved to be immensely beneficial to the development of Western theology, albeit in some sort of tacit or hidden manner. This is what I called the “soft revolution” of Western scholasticism – a revolution that did not shake the theological establishment because it happened within the doctrinal framework associated with it. It is this revolution that will provide the matter of my last point.

¹⁵ One could for instance read in the *scholia* of the 13th c. Parisian Dionysian *Corpus*: “One should know that neither the Godhead is the essence of God just as goodness [...] is not his essence but his glory or a conception about Him (*opinio de eo*)” quoted by H. F. Dondaine 1952, 71 (my translation). “[...] ‘in our fatherland face to face’: He will not be seen according to His substance (*in substantia sua*) in any of these modes; it is according to His activity that He will be known (*ab actu suo cognoscitur*). [...] John [Chrysostom] does not want to say that we will be able to contemplate the substance of God in the fatherland because this is impossible to creatures [...]. What John means is [a vision] through a mirror, in enigma, since in the fatherland we will clearly see God through an immediate influx of light (*per immediatam acceptionem luminis*), though not according to the essence, but as glory, goodness and truth”, H. F. Dondaine 1952, 82 (my translation). The Eriugenan speculations on the notion of theophania are glossed upon by a number of theologians at the time, including St. Albert. Here again, it is the rediscovery of the Greek Fathers that explains this Eriugenan revival, even if a number of *sententiae* ascribed to them had in fact been transmitted through Eriugena. It is the case of a number of *scholia* to Dionysius attributed to Maximus the Confessor in the *Corpus* of the 13th century. This is the way in which one or more compiler(s) thought of preserving the texts of Eriugena after the ban of 1225; see H. F. Dondaine 1953.

¹⁶ I consider as an anachronism the idea that the Avicennism of 1241 is a pre-sequel of the Averroist drama that will take place at the University of Paris from the second half of the 13th century down to the Renaissance. The truth is that 1241 is on the contrary the final outcome of the twelfth century's strenuous quest to forge a comprehensive picture of the cosmos – from God's creative activity to the eternal vision of the elect – on the basis of Eriugena and the rediscovery of the Greek Fathers. The *theologi* of 1241 proved to be respectable heirs to a current that, rooted in the symbolism of Honorius of Autun, Hildegard of Bingen, and the early School of Chartres influenced a number of Cistercians, William of St. Thierry in the first place. During the same period, Gilbert of Porret added to it the Aristotle-inspired logical apparatus which became the distinguishing mark of his disciples among secular masters. These tried to show that an alliance between the Greek Fathers and Avicenna's type of Aristotelianism could open perspectives which, while coinciding with Christian dogma, evaded the narrow Augustinism that served as a common frame of reference at the University of Paris. On the 11th c. and early 12th c. origins of this movement, see D'Alverny 1953.

3 Aquinas as a metaphysical translator of the Greek Fathers

It is a well-established fact that all traces of the pre-Palamite reading of the Greek Fathers were carefully wiped away from the Latin world in the aftermath of the 1241 condemnations.¹⁷ Not less than three general chapters ask the Dominican friars to erase these errors from their textbooks (1243, 1244 and 1256). Whatever theological constructs would emerge after this date – and God knows what brilliant constructs did see the light of day during this period! – they were required to comply with the Augustinian principles that had prevailed over the Hellenic views of the theologians condemned in 1241.

This historical situation meets the first requirement of our hypothesis; namely, that the West had known about a pre-Palamite line of thought in the writings of the Greek Fathers long before – more or less a century before – the Palamite controversy broke out in Byzantium. But this seems to render the ultimate segment of our hypothesis all the more difficult to establish. Indeed, if Aquinas was faithful to the anti-Greek condemnations of 1241, how can he at the same time appear to be so faithful to the Greek Fathers that Kydones' translations of Aquinas can to a certain extent even be considered as an act of theological retroversion?

¹⁷ “Haec opinio recessit ab aula” indicates Eudes Rigaud after dismissing the speculations on God’s infinite irradiation of his master, Alexander of Hales – who, by the way, had been sitting with him on the bench of Parisian censors in 1241. In actual fact, Alexander of Hales had himself professed an agnosticism akin to the one he condemned in 1241: “[...] the divine essence as such is invisible. Whenever it is present in one of us, it is so by virtue of [its] glory. It then becomes visible, and this light is called aspect (*species*). Or it can be seen according to its likeness (*per similitudinem*) that is created reality (*creatura*)”, *Glossa in Sent.*, d. 1, n. 18 quoted by H. F. Dondaine 1952, 80; see equally Callebaut 1927. Commenting Chrysostom’s “Deum nemo vidit umquam” in his *Postilla*, Hugues of Saint-Cher gives up the distinction he had previously drawn between God’s essence and God’s operation, writing that “God will not be seen in His substance but He will be known according to His activity [...] as Glory, Goodness and Truth”. This passage, by chance preserved in one manuscript, was later replaced by a perfectly Augustinian gloss. Reading the passage by Chrysostom, good Christians were henceforth asked to understand that the saints and angels do not see God *plene* or fully, see H. F. Dondaine 1949 and H. F. Dondaine 1952, 82–83. The *Commentary on the Sentences* of John Pagus one of the theologians suspected, also bears witness to the pressure of doctrinal orthodoxy after 1241. In the Padua manuscript, Pagus discusses the issue of God’s vision in the terms of 1241: the need for a vision proportionate to finite intellects is mentioned and presented as an explanation of the agnosticism of the Greek *auctoritates*. But the solution promoted by himself and his colleagues (Stephen of Venizy most probably) is no longer an option: “Some have claimed that God cannot be seen according to His nature, that He can only be seen according to His radiance (*claritas*). They erred since the radiance of God is His nature. Seeing His radiance and seeing this nature is one and the same thing”, see Gründel 1958, 78 (my translation). But John does not offer here any alternative solution to the issue concerning the immediate vision of God.

At this point, let us call recast Schlegel's insight regarding the art of translation. A bad translation is a translation that manifests something of the geniality and, therefore, the untranslatable character of the original text. Meanwhile, an excellent translation, a translation that manages to build a semantic economy equivalent to that of the original, is a translation that manages to mask the untranslatable greatness of this original text. In my opinion, the attempt of the theologians condemned in 1241 had all the aspects of a "bad translation" à la Schlegel. It collided with the quintessential elements that shaped the Latin theological language, namely, the Augustinian understanding that God was simple, that there was no real difference between God's essence and His will or operation, that the act of divine creation was without intermediaries and that the reward of the elect was the direct contemplation of God's essence. I would simultaneously claim that, by contrast, Aquinas' theology presents all the characters of an excellent theological translation of the Greek Fathers by the same measure. It manages to connect the basic elements of the Western Augustinian language in such a coherent way that the original thinking of the Greek Fathers becomes unrecognisable at the very moment it is faithfully translated or rather theologically transposed.

Let us take therefore a quick and, unfortunately, very schematic look at the way in which the three great thinkers who rose to preeminence at the time of or right after the condemnations – Albert the Great, Bonaventure and Aquinas – incorporated the Hellenic-Dionysian emanationism into their theological constructs. In their teaching, the cosmological intermediaries between God's essence and created things disappear entirely – and together with them the dream of representing God's creation as a symbolic continuum that would challenge Augustine's sternly doctrinal perspective.

Albert splits the continuum into two parts that are ontologically connected: the organisation of the universe is nothing but the immediate though very imperfect echo of the motionless outpourings – *fluxus* – of Goodness that are supposed to convey the inner dynamism of God's being. Meanwhile, Bonaventure substitutes the ascending journey of the theological and mystical intellect towards God with the descending cosmological order of Dionysian emanationism. Like Albert, Aquinas looks at Dionysian emanationism primarily from a cosmological point of view, far from reducing it like Bonaventure to the fragmentation of the human mind wrestling with God's transcendence. However he does not refer it to God's inner dynamism like his former master. For Aquinas, emanationism is the very act of creation and deification, absolutely one and motionless in God, as seen by the very creatures that are subjected to it within space and time, that is, fragmentarily or according to their finite capacity of reception. As Aquinas writes in his *Commentary to Dionysius's Divine Names*, "What a divine name manifests is the way a divine perfection proceeds from God to the realm of things that are, and it is in virtue of this process that God is said to be beyond everything that exists" (610). In other words, the key to emanationism lies in the finite condition of the subject that is the object of God's creation: noetically, it perceives God as manifesting Himself through a plurality of attributes – goodness, truth, etc – because being created means partaking of God's unique and motionless being *kat'analogian*, that is, in

proportion to its finite capacity of reception. Dionysian emanations no longer speak of the way God relates to His creation, as was the case for the *theologi* of 1241. Nor are they an extrinsic reflection of God's inner life or the outcome of a created intellect in search of God's Trinitarian simplicity. These emanations speak about the way finite intellects relate to God due to their created condition. Very paradoxically, Aquinas conceives the whole reality pertaining to the act of creation as being logically posterior to the creature, just as a real relation is logically posterior to the substance in which it inheres.¹⁸ This implicit anthropocentric or rather *ktistocentric* reversal is what I call a soft cosmological revolution. It is born out of the necessity to stick to the Augustinian identity between God's essence and operation. As the created subject examines *a posteriori* the origin of its existence, it understands that the multiple perfections that it perceives are not intermediaries between God and itself, but the noetic outcome within space and time of an absolute actuality that contains them all in the mode of a transcendent and inseparable unity.

I believe one cannot understand Aquinas' soft cosmological revolution without understanding what made Kydones' translations an act of theological retroversion from Greek to Greek via Latin. What Palamas pointed out is that the tradition of the Fathers never considered God's energy(ies) as an intermediary between God and the cosmos. The divine energies that fashion the cosmos are the relative outpouring, analogically proportioned to the finiteness of space and time, of the energy that eternally and inseparably radiates from God's transcendent *Ousia*. Reverse Palamas' cosmic or *ktizocentric* perspective and you will find Aquinas' *ktistocentric* or anthropocentric worldview. The multiple names given to God's creative operation reflect the proportionate or analogical way in which the created order can receive or suffer God's eternal actuality, being-in-energy. The same thing goes for the supernatural order. For Palamas, created grace or supernatural *hexis* is the outcome within time and space of an outpouring of uncreated energy that sets the faculties of intellectual creatures far above their own nature.¹⁹ For Aquinas, created grace as supernatural *habitus* points to a promotion of the receptive faculties of intellectual creatures high above the limits of their nature by Gods' eternal being-in-energy.

This transposition in Latin terms of the Greek tradition's most fundamental insight worked so well, that it came to be understood as excluding the original Greek perspective advocated by Palamas when Kydones translated Aquinas' works into Greek.

¹⁸ See *ST* Ia, q. 45, a. 3; *QdP* q. 3, a. 3; *SG* II, c. 18. § 951–954.

¹⁹ "When you will have in your soul the divine *habitus* ($\Theta\epsilon\alpha\acute{\epsilon}\xi\zeta$), you will really possess God within yourself; and the true divine *habitus* ($\Theta\epsilon\alpha\acute{\epsilon}\xi\zeta$) is the love of God, something which happens only through the holy practice of the divine commandments. It is their principle, their centre and their supreme achievement", Palamas, *Complete Works of Gregory Palamas*, vol. 1, P. K. Christou (editor), Thessaloniki 1987, 2, 3, 77, p. 610 (my translation); compare with translation by Meyendorff 1973, p. 548. On the notion of created grace in the thought of St. Gregory, see equally Meyendorff 1959a, 231–232.

The emphasis of Aquinas on created grace hid the transcendent synergy associated with it, just as Palamas' emphasis on uncreated grace overshadowed the created *hexis* that went with it. Likewise, Aquinas' developments on the vision of God's essence were interpreted independently of his affirmation of God's essential incomprehensibility, while the Palamites' insistence on Palamas' vision of God according to his eternal energies left the inseparable character of God's essence and God's energy in the shadow.

Looking critically at two hundred years of theological reflection in the West and in the East, one can hardly justify the anti-Palamite stance of Demetrios Kydones and his circle. And yet the insight that overwhelmed Demetrios when he discovered the thought of Aquinas, the insight that led him to translate Aquinas into Greek, was absolutely correct. Truly, Aquinas understood the Greek tradition much better than many Byzantine intellectuals of his time – Demetrios himself included, I am forced to add.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abbreviations

PG: J.-P. Migne (editor), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*, Paris, 1857–1886
 PL: J. P. Migne (editor), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*, Paris, 1844–1879
In Sent.: Thomas Aquinas, *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum*
 SG: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra Gentiles*
 ST.: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*
 QdP: Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestiones Disputatae de Potentia*

Primary Sources

P. Lucentini, ed. (2010). *Anonymous, Contra Amaurianos*. Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis, 232. Leuven.

G. Heil and A. M. Ritter, eds. (1991). *Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite*, Corpus Dionysiacum ii: Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De coelesti hierarchia, de ecclesiastica hierarchia, de mystica theologia, epistulae. Patristische Texte und Studien, 36. Berlin.

E. Behler, ed. (2013). *F. Schlegel, Athenäums-Fragmente und andere Schriften*. Berlin.

Gilbertus Porretanus, Super Boethii de hebdomadibus (1844). Vol. 64. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina. Paris, cols. 1311–1334.

P. K. Christou, ed. (1962–1992). *Gregorios Palamas*, Complete Works of Gregory Palamas. 5 vols. Thessaloniki.

J. Meyendorff, ed. (1973). *Gregorios Palamas*, Défense des saints hésychastes. Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Études et documents 30. Louvain.

F. Gastaldelli, ed. (1983). *Guillelmus a Lucca*, Comentum in tertiam ierarchiam Dionisii que est de divinis nominibus. Florence.

M. F. Moos, ed. (1956). *Thomas Aquinas*, Scriptum super libros Sententiarum. Paris.

P. M. Pession, ed. (1965). *Thomas Aquinas*, Quaestiones disputatae de potentia. Turin and Rome.

P. Marc, C. Pera, and P. Caramello, eds. (1961). *Thomas Aquinas, Summa Contra Gentiles*. 2–3 vols. Turin and Rome.

Collège Dominicain d'Ottawa, ed. (1941–1945). *Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae*. Ottawa.

Secondary Sources

Callebaut, A. (1927). "Alexandre de Halès et ses confrères en face des condamnations parisiennes de 1241 et 1244". In: *France Franciscaine* 10, pp. 257–272.

Capelle, C. (1932). *Autour du décret de 1210: Amaury de Bène*. Paris.

Chenu, M.-D. (1947). "Le dernier avatar de la théologie orientale au XIIIe siècle". In: *Mélanges Auguste Pelzer: Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale de la Scolastique médiévale offertes à Monseigneur Auguste Pelzer à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie 3, 26. Louvain, pp. 159–181.

Chenu, M.-D. (1969). "Érigène à Citeaux". In: *La Philosophie et ses problèmes, Mélanges offerts à Mgr R. Jolivet*. Lyon and Paris, pp. 99–107.

D'Alverny, M.-T. (1950–1951). "Un fragment du procès des amauriens". In: *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen-Age* 18, pp. 325–336.

D'Alverny, M.-T. (1953). "Le cosmos symbolique du XIe siècle". In: *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen-Age* 20, pp. 31–81.

De Contenson, P. M. (1959). "Avicennisme latin et vision de Dieu au début du XIIIe s." In: *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen-Age* 26, pp. 29–97.

De Vaux, R. (1934). *Notes et textes sur l'Avicennisme latin aux confins du XIe et XIIIe siècles*. Paris.

Dondaine, H. F. (1949). "Hugues de S. Cher et la condamnation de 1241". In: *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 33, pp. 170–174.

Dondaine, H. F. (1950). "Cinq citations de Jean Scot chez Simon de Tournai". In: *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 17, pp. 303–311.

Dondaine, H. F. (1952). "L'objet et le medium de la vision béatifique". In: *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 19, pp. 60–130.

Dondaine, H. F. (1953). *Le Corpus dionysien de l'Université de Paris au XIIIe siècle*. Rome.

Gründel, J. (1958). "Die Sentenzenglosse des Johanes Pagus (circa 1243–1145) in Padua". In: *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 9, pp. 71–85.

Jeauneau, E. (1987). "Le renouveau érigénien du XIe siècle". In: *Eriugena redivivus. Zur Wirkungsgeschichte seines Denkens im Mittelalter und im Übergang zur Neuzeit. Vorträge des V. Internationalen Eriugena-Colloquiums, Werner-Reimers-Stiftung Bad Homburg* 26.–30. August 1985. Ed. by W. Beierwaltes, pp. 26–42.

Lobel, D. (2000). *Between Mysticism and Philosophy, Sufi language of religious experience in Judah Ha-Levi Book of Kuzari*. New-York.

Meyendorff, J. (1959a). *Introduction à l'étude de Gregoire Palamas*. Patristica Sorbonensis 3. Paris.

Vicaire, M.-D. (1937). "Les Porrétiens et l'avicennisme avant 1215". In: *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 26, pp. 449–482.

Panagiotis C. Athanasopoulos

Bessarion of Nicaea vs. Mark Eugenicus

On the Thomistic *principium individuationis* in material composites

In the preparation of his participation in the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–39), Mark Eugenicus conducted intense research resulting in his *Capita Syllogistica*,¹ which addressed several theological debates, with the *Filioque* holding a prominent place.² Since a major aspect of this issue concerns the *distinctio in divinis*, i. e. the distinction of the three persons of the Holy Trinity, Mark addressed the Thomistic *principia individuationis* in his *Capita Syllogistica*, 25.³ This sparked Bessarion's reply in his *Refutatio*, 7.⁴

In this paper, I will lay out the argumentation of these two rivals on matter as a principle of distinction, focusing on their declared and undeclared sources. As will be shown, Mark utilized arguments from Scotus' *Ordinatio*. On the other hand, Bessarion utilized Aristotelian passages (mainly), as far back as Alexander of Aphrodisias, Themistius and Demetrius Kydones. As far as the form of Mark's argumentation is concerned, I will show that he developed his reasoning in the mode of a Scholastic *quaestio*.

Individuation holds a prominent place among the problems of medieval philosophy.⁵ One of the most important aspects of the issue is the principle of individuation,⁶

I am grateful to J. A. Demetracopoulos (University of Patras) for providing access to the apparatus fontium of his on-going edition of Nilus Kabasilas' *De processione Spiritus sancti*; for facilitating my access to ms. Vat. Gr. 614 and for his useful remarks; C. Kappes (SS. Cyril and Methodius Byzantine Seminary) for drawing my attention to Duns Scotus as the source of Mark Eugenicus' argumentation, and his useful remarks.

¹ Monfasani 2011b, 167–168 has convincingly argued that the *Capita Syllogistica* predates the Council.

² This *cause célèbre* was one of the major issues discussed in the Council (Gill 1961, 227–269), in which Mark took a leading role (see *Acta Graeca*, II sqq., ed. J. Gill, *Quae supersunt actorum Graecorum concilii Florentini* [CFDS, Ser. B, vol. V, 2], Roma 1953, p. 253, 32 sqq.). For Mark's *res gestae* in the Council, see Kappes 2014a; Kappes 2016.

³ *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 1–144, ed. L. Petit, *Marci Eugenici Metropolitae Ephesi opera anti-unionistica* (CFDS, Ser. A, vol. X, 2), Roma 1977, p. 85, 18–p. 89, 12.

⁴ *Refutatio*, 7, ed. J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*, vol. CLXI, Parisiis 1866, coll. 193C–204D. It should be noted that Scholarios did not address this issue in his *Responsio*, ed. OCGS, III, Paris 1930, p. 476–538. For the authorship of this text, see Monfasani 2011b, 164–168.

⁵ Gracia 1994, 1.

⁶ Gracia 1994, 13.

i. e. the criterion that may distinguish the many things of a kind into numerical individuals, e. g. the factor that determines a human to be a unique object among the many of his kind, which means a person distinct from other persons.⁷

There follows a brief exposition of Thomas' view on the subject, since it is fundamental for understanding the argumentation of the two rivals. The basic Scholastic theories on the principle of individuation are the following: a) bundle theories, b) accidental theories, c) essential theories, d) existential theories, and e) external theories.⁸ According to this classification, Thomas' view falls into the essential theories, and more specifically into the first variety of these, which attributes the principle of individuation to matter. Yet Thomas combines matter with dimension, which is featured in the accidental theories.⁹ Indeed, Thomas considered that quantified matter can distinguish one composite object from another:¹⁰ “*Principium diversitatis individuorum eiusdem speciei est divisio materiae secundum quantitatem*”.¹¹

Mark starts his refutation by stating that the Latins boast about their principles of individuation, presumably applicable to every case of beings, i. e. the distinction *per materiam* (in composites) and *per oppositionem* (*in divinis*). In the vein of Barlaam the Calabrian,¹² Mark notes that even if such distinctions hold true in other things, it would not be necessary to apply either of them to the Divinity.¹³ Although Mark does not name Thomas, it is certain that he was his main target, as Bessarion points out.¹⁴

⁷ Cf. Gracia 1984, 17–21; 36–37.

⁸ Gracia 1984, 39–46; Gracia 1994, 13–14.

⁹ Gracia 1994, 14–15.

¹⁰ Owens 1994, 188.

¹¹ SG, II, 49, 4, ed. C. Pera, D. P. Marc, D. P. Caramello, S. *Thomae Aquinatis “Liber de veritate catholicae fidei contra errores infidelium” seu “Summa contra Gentiles”*, vol. II, Taurini-Romae 1961, p. 170, n. 1250. For more on Thomas' view on the issue, see Owens 1994, 173–194.

¹² Barlaam had also rejected the application of philosophical principles to the *distinctio in divinis* in his *Contra Latinos* (Tractatus B), I, 12, 125–129, ed. A. Fyrigos, *Barlaam Calabro. Opere Contro I Latini*, vol. II, Studi e Testi 348, Città del Vaticano 1998, p. 256, 4–8: “Τὰ γάρ κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν δόγματα χαιρέτω. Οὐδὲ γάρ ἐξ αὐτῶν τὸ τῆς Τριάδος ἐμυήθημεν μυστήριον, οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ πρὸς αὐτὰ ἀναφέροντας δεῖ ζητεῖν τὴν ὁμοφωνίαν οὐτ’ ἄλλου τῶν τῆς πίστεως δογμάτων οὔτε τῆς παρούσης ὑποθέσεως (i. e. the identity and the distinction of the three persons in Trinity)”.

¹³ Mark Eugenicus, *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 1–8, p. 85, 18–25 Petit.

¹⁴ *Refutatio*, 7, coll. 193C–196A Migne.

Mark's basis for his refutation is Thomas' *ST*, I^a, q. 36, a. 2, co.¹⁵ and *SG*, IV, 24, 8,¹⁶ which he had already addressed in *Capita Syllogistica*, 13, 1–7,¹⁷ as regards the *distinctio in divinis*. This is quite expected, since these passages, among others, were utilized by Mark's predecessors in this discussion; namely, by the anti-Thomists Barlaam¹⁸ and Nilus Kabasilas.¹⁹ Mark's dependence on Nilus for the Thomistic principles of distinction was first identified by Scholarios.²⁰

15 *ST*, I^a q. 36, a. 2, co. ed. Leonina, *Sancti Thome Aquinatis opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, vol. IV: *Pars prima “Summae Theologiae”*, a quaestione I ad quaestionem XLIX, Roma 1888, p. 377: "...solum relationibus divinae personae ab invicem distinguuntur. Relationes autem personas distinguer non possunt, nisi secundum quod sunt oppositae. [...] Oportet ergo quod Filius et Spiritus sanctus ad invicem referantur oppositis relationibus. Non autem possunt esse in divinis aliae relationes oppositae nisi relationes originis, ut supra probatum est. Oppositae autem relationes originis accipiuntur secundum principium, et secundum quod est a principio. [...] Unde et secundum hoc manifestum est quod Spiritus sanctus procedit a Filio. Ipse etiam ordo rerum hoc docet. Nusquam enim hoc invenimus, quod ab uno procedant plura absque ordine, nisi in illis solum quae materialiter differunt; sicut unus faber producit multos cultellos materialiter ab invicem distinctos, nullum ordinem habentes ad invicem. Sed in rebus in quibus non est sola materialis distinctio, semper invenitur in multitudine productorum aliquis ordo. Unde etiam in ordine creaturarum productarum, decor divinae sapientiae manifestatur. Si ergo ab una persona Patris procedunt duae personae, scilicet Filius et Spiritus sanctus, oportet esse aliquem ordinem eorum ad invicem. Nec potest aliquis ordo alius assignari, nisi ordo naturae, quo alius est ex alio. Non est igitur possibile dicere quod Filius et Spiritus sanctus sic procedant a Patre, quod neuter eorum procedat ab alio, nisi quis poneret in eis materialem distinctionem, quod est impossibile."

16 *SG*, IV, 24, 8, ed. C. Pera, D. P. Marc, D. P. Caramello, *S. Thome Aquinatis “Liber de veritate catholicae fidei contra errores infidelium” seu “Summa contra Gentiles”*, vol. III, Taurini-Romae 1961, p. 294, n. 3612: "In rebus enim, remota materiali distinctione, quae in divinis personis locum habere non potest, non inveniuntur aliqua distingui nisi per aliquam oppositionem."

17 *Capita Syllogistica*, 13, 1–7, p. 76, 8–14 Petit.

18 *Contra Latinos* (Tractatus A), IV, 21, 186–204, p. 570, 9–27 Fyrigos: "Οὐ δεξόμεθα ἄρα Θωμᾶν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀξιώμασι καὶ ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐννοίαις συμπεριλαμβάνοντα κτιστὸν καὶ ἀκτιστὸν, ὑλικὸν καὶ ἄνθλον, ὃν καὶ οὐκ ὅν, οὐσίαν καὶ ὑπερούσιον, τὴν πρωτίστην τῶν ὄλων ἀρχὴν καὶ τὰ ἔσχατα τῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς, ἀλλ’ ὅταν λέγῃ· Ἐάν πολλὰ προέρχωνται ἐξ ἐνὸς ἀντιθέτων καὶ οὐσιωδῶς, ἀναγκαῖον τινα τάξιν ἔχειν πρὸς ἀλληλα τὰ προερχόμενα, ή Ἀναγκαῖον πάντα τὰ διαφέροντα ἀλλήλων, ή καθ’ ὑλην ή κατὰ μίαν τῶν τεσσάρων ἀντιθέσεων διακρίνεσθαι, [...] φήσομεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὅτι· [...] ήν δὲ ἡμεῖς τριάδα σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν, αὐτῇ τῶν σῶν τε λογισμῶν καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἀναγκῶν καὶ λόγων παντάπασιν ἔστιν ἐλευθέρα." For the Thomistic references in this passage, see Fyrigos 1998, appar. cr., ad locum.

19 *De processione Spiritus sancti*, 1, 79, 1–12, ed. E. Candal, *Nilus Cabasilas et theologia S. Thome de processione Spiritus sancti*, Studi e Testi 116, Città del Vaticano 1945, p. 250, 28–p. 252, 10: "Καὶ μήν [...] ποια ἐν τούτοις ἐναντιότης ἡ διαφέροι ἂν εἰδος εἴδους, ὡς ὁ Θωμᾶς ἀξιοῖ; Εἰ μὲν γάρ κατ’ ἐναντίωσιν ἡ διάκρισις, [...] καὶ διάφορα πάντως κατ’ εἶδος: εἰ δὲ τούτο, οὐ πάντως κάκεῖνο. Καὶ χωρὶς δὲ τούτων, τό τε λευκὸν καὶ φαιόν, διακεριμένα ὄντα, οὐκ ἂν ῥῷδιώς ὑπάγοιντο τῷ παρὰ τοῦ Θωμᾶ κανόνι τῆς διακρίσεως. Οὐκοῦν ἀνάγκη ἡ μὴ διακρίνεσθαι τὰ προειρημένα, ή ψεύδεσθαι τὸν προεκτεθέντα κανόνα πάντα διακρίνοντα ἡ τῇ ύλῃ, η ἐνὶ γε τρόπῳ τῆς ἀντιθέσεως. Ἀλλὰ μήν τούτων διακρινομένων, ἀνάγκη μὴ πάντα ἀληθῆ τὸν λόγον νομίζειν, μηδὲ τῶν ὄντων διαιτητὴν ἀξιόχρεων. Οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ ὅσα ἐκ τούτων Λατīνοι περαίνειν βούλονται, πάντως ἀν εἰεν ἀληθῆ."

20 *Responsio*, VI (XIII), 67–73, p. 499, 29–35 OCGS, III.

Mark intends to prove that such distinctions are not necessary, nor universally valid as premises or principles, in created beings for two reasons: a) they are not, in practice, actually and universally applicable in Thomas' own writings, even if they are initially treated as such,²¹ and b) neither matter, nor relative opposition, is the cause of distinction in beings, but an accident (*παρακολούθημα*) or natural product arising out of already actual and distinguished beings. This structural corollary or accident can individuate only in a secondary structural moment.²² Mark unfolds his argumentation against the putatively Thomistic individuating principle of matter, as follows: Matter *per se* is indivisible and indistinctive, since it lacks quality and quantity. What is indivisible and indistinctive cannot individuate. Hence, since prime matter is indifferent in itself, it cannot establish a difference in material things.²³

It seems that this twofold reduction of Thomas' material principle derives from Duns Scotus.²⁴ To my knowledge, this is the first time that a Scotist source is spotted in Mark's works. Indeed, on the one hand, Mark reduces quantitative matter to *materia prima* alone as the Thomistic *principium individuationis*, in the vein of Scotus' *Ord.*, II, d. 3, q. 4.²⁵ On the other hand, Mark reduces quantitative matter (as a remote cause) to the proximate cause of individuation, a mere accident (*παρακολούθημα*) of already related and distinguished principles (that is, *this form* and *this matter*²⁶) of beings, following Scotus statement: "...quantitas, et quodcumque aliud accidens, erit

²¹ Such a statement is congruent to Barlaam's text in n. 12. Given that Mark held for universal hylomorphism (Kappes 2016, 137), he may also recall that Thomas divides the rules that apply to angels (equally a *res vis-a-vis SG*, IV, 24, 8 Pera, Marc, Caramello, p. 294, n. 3612 [supra n. 16]) from the rules that apply to individuation in all other entities. Thus, Thomas' view that angels lack matter renders the material principle invalid for such a distinction. For the hylomorphism of angels, see Keck 1998, 93–99.

²² *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 9–19, p. 85, 26–36 Petit. Such a statement is congruent to Mark's patristic view on the “looser unity” of soul to body (that is, form to matter) in *Oratio prima de pugne purgatorio*, 14, 8, ed. L. Petit, *Documents relatifs au Concile de Florence* (PO, 15), 1927, p. 58, 29–p. 59, 13 (Kappes 2016, 136–137).

²³ *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 20–28, p. 86, 1–9 Petit.

²⁴ For Scotus' critique on Thomas' *principium individuationis* and the formation of the Scotist *haecceitas*, see Minges 1930, 64–67; Wolter 1994; Faitanin 2002; Noone 2003. For a bibliography on this issue, see Faitanin 2002, 3, n. 1. Some modern authors affirm what Scotus objected to Thomas; namely, the designated matter fails to qualify as a real principle, since it can be reduced to a structural potentiality for actually existing forms (Owens 1994, 182; Cross 1999, 74–75; Noone 2003, 116–117). In this aspect, matter is the unqualified principle, whereas designated matter falls, as a species, under the genus “matter” and merely describes its modality (quantitative dimension).

²⁵ *Ord.*, II, d. 3, q. 4, n. 93, 8–11, ed. P. C. Balić et al., *Ioannis Duns Scoti opera omnia*, vol. VII, Civitas Vaticana 1973, p. 436, 12–p. 437, 2: “...ita quod sicut materia non est habens partes per naturam quantitatis (quia pars materiae est materia), sic substantia signata non est nisi substantia (solum enim dicit ‘signatio’ modum se habendi)”.

²⁶ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, I^a, q. 29, a. 2, ad 3, p. 330 Leonina: “...essentia proprie est id quod significatur per definitionem. Definitio autem complectitur principia speciei, non autem principia individualia. Unde in rebus compositis ex materia et forma, essentia significat non solum formam, nec

posterior naturaliter substantia... ”.²⁷ Yet Mark states that quantity, as an accident, can individuate secondarily. This is exactly what Scotus argues: “Sed quomodo ad istam intentionem est verum quod varietas accidentium facit differentiam numeralem? Dico quod facit aliquam differentiam, sed non primam, – et necessario concomitatur omnem; et ita habet intelligi quod ‘faciunt differentiam numeralem’”.²⁸ Moreover, Mark draws his argumentation partly *verbatim* from Scotus’ *Ord.*, II, d. 3, q. 5,²⁹ as regards the lack of quantity in prime matter.³⁰

Mark Eugenicus, *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 20–25 (Petit, p. 86, 1–6):

Ἡ γένη καθ' αὐτήν ἔστιν ἀδιαίρετος· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἄποιος, οὕτω καὶ ἄποσος· τὸ ἄποσον δὲ ἀδιαίρετον· τὸ ἀδιαίρετον δὲ ἀδιάκριτον· ὃ δὲ καθ'

Duns Scotus, *Ord.*, II, d. 3, q. 5:

Sed quod non est in se distinctum nec diversum, non potest esse prima ratio diversitatis vel distinctionis alterius; sed materia est fundamentum naturae omnino in-

solum materiam, sed compositum ex materia et forma communi, prout sunt principia speciei. Sed compositum ex hac materia et ex hac forma, habet rationem hypostasis et personae, anima enim et caro et os sunt de ratione hominis, sed haec anima [= forma] et haec caro [= materia] et hoc os [viz., parakolouthema] sunt de ratione huius hominis. Et ideo hypostasis et persona addunt supra rationem essentiae principia individualia.” It is possible that Mark takes this passage into account, since it sets the background of the discussion. Besides, as will be shown, Bessarion utilized it in his argumentation.

27 *Ord.*, II, d. 3, q. 4, n. 118, 20–21, p. 451, 10–11 Balić et al. Cf. also q. 4, n. 96, 5–10, p. 437, 20–p. 438, 5 Balić et al.: “sed singularitas – sive signatio – est necessaria condicio in substantia ad causandum quantitatatem, quia (sicut argutum est) causatum singulare requirit causam singularem; ergo impossibile est istam signationem substantiae signatae vel singularis esse a quantitate singulari (vel esse a causato), non a substantia in inquantum singularis”.

28 *Ord.*, II, d. 3, q. 4, n. 125, 1–5, p. 454, 15–19 Balić et al. Cf. q. 4, n. 87, 1–8, p. 432, 17–p. 433, 5 Balić et al.: “Praeterea, eo modo substantia est prior naturaliter omni accidente, quo est subiectum omni accidenti. In quantum enim subiectum, probatur esse prius definitione omni accidente, quia sic ponitur in ordine ‘cuiuslibet’ per additamentum; sed ut est subiectum, est ‘haec substantia’: quia secundum Philosophum I *Physicorum* et II *Metaphysicae*, singularium sunt causae singulares (in quocumque genere causae), ergo singularis accidentis singulare subiectum est causa.”; q. 4, n. 124, 4–7, p. 454, 6–9 Balić et al.: “Dico quod omnem distinctionem numeralem concomitatur distinctio accidentium, et ideo ubi nulla potest esse accidentium varietas, ibi nulla potest esse distinctio numeralis.”

29 *Ord.*, II, d. 3, q. 5, n. 131, 3–7, p. 458, 11–15 Balić et al.

30 Mark's reference to the lack of quality in prime matter is a commonplace, e.g. Posidonius, Fr. 267, 1–3, ed. W. Theiler, *Posidonios. Die Fragmente*, vol. I, Berlin 1982, 190, 19–21; Alexander Aphrodisiensis, *De Anima*, p. 17, 17 ed. I. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora* (CAG, suppl. II, 1), Berlin 1887; Michael Ephesius (Ps.-Alexander Aphrodisiensis), *In Aristotelis Metaphysica*, XI 10, 32–34 ed. M. Hayduck, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis metaphysica commentaria* (CAG, I), Berlin 1891, p. 717, 32–34; Ps.-Alexander Aphrodisiensis, *Quaestiones et solutiones*, I, 15, 25–27; II, 3, 66; 7, 1–4, ed. I. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora* (CAG, suppl. II, 2), Berlin 1892, p. 27, 21–23; p. 49, 30; p. 52, 20–23. For a recent synopsis of the attribution of Ps.-Alexander of Aphrodisias' *In Aristotelis Metaphysica* E-N to Michael Ephesius, see di Giovanni and Primavesi 2016, 11–16.

αύτὸ μὴ διαιρεῖται καὶ διακρί-
νεται, πῶς ἀν ἔτερῳ τὴν αἰτίαν
παρέχοι τῆς διακρίσεως;

distinctum et indeterminatum;
igitur non potest esse prima ra-
tio distinctionis vel diversitatis al-
terius.

Mark continues: The division of the material body *per materiam per se* into measurable and distinctive parts is called material distinction. Nevertheless, this does not render the matter as a principle of distinction, because, as mentioned above, it is indivisible. On the contrary, it is the division *per materiam*, which offers quantity to the distinctive parts. This is supported by the following argument: The distinction in material composites is not established in matter *per se*, but in the composite object, such as the actuality in composite objects is the effect of the combination of species (i. e. form) and matter (and is not established in the species *per se*). Therefore, the distinction is caused by the division *per materiam*.³¹

Mark's reference to the material distinction may derive from Scotus' statement that "prior est distinctio partium materiae quam quantitatis...".³² Accordingly, based on the lack of distinctive parts in prime matter,³³ Mark concludes that the division according to matter is the principle of individuation. This apparently echoes Scotus' *Ord.*, II, d. 3: "Est ergo divisio naturae, in suppositis creatis, prima et maxima ratio distinctionis".³⁴ In this aspect, matter/quantity are considered only as secondary principles of individuation.³⁵ Moreover, Mark's argumentation on the lack of actuality in species/form is based on Scotus' view that quantity is not an active form.³⁶ As regards the identification of form with species, Mark may also be recalling Thomas' relevant statement that form is actually equivalent to species.³⁷ Subsequently, Mark turns to the refutation of Thomas' *distinctio per oppositionem*³⁸ and ends by reaffirming his thesis on division as the principle of distinction.³⁹

The mere fact that Mark utilized Scotist arguments raises the possibility of him asking his fellow disciple, Scholarios, to translate some Scotist material for him. Such an assumption is quite plausible, since in the preparation of his participating to the Council of Florence, Scholarios had studied the Scotist view on the *Filioque* and the

³¹ *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 28–48, p. 86, 9–29 Petit.

³² *Ord.*, II, d. 3, q. 4, n. 114, 8–9, p. 447, 16–17 Balić et al.

³³ See n. 25.

³⁴ *Ord.*, II, d. 3, q. 4, n. 127, 14–15, p. 456, l. 12–13 Balić et al. Cf. also q. 4, n. 105, 5–8, p. 443, 6–9 Balić et al.: "sed quantitas non inest formaliter speciei, in quantum est divisibilis in partes subiectivas; igitur ipsa non est 'ratio formalis' divisibilitatis talis totius in partes tales".

³⁵ Cf. n. 22.

³⁶ *Ord.*, d. 3, q. 4, n. 97, 7, p. 438, 12 Balić et al.: "...quantitas non est forma activa".

³⁷ Thomas' *ST*, Ia, q. 29, a. 2, ad 3, p. 330 Leonina. Cf. Kappes 2013a, 89, n. 71.

³⁸ *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 49–93, p. 86, 30–p. 87, 36 Petit.

³⁹ *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 93–96, p. 87, 36–88, 1 Petit.

individuation *in divinis*.⁴⁰ Besides, most probably Scholarios was acquainted with the Scholastic reduction of Thomas' principle some years previously, since in his *Prolegomena* (1433–1435⁴¹), he followed Radulphus Brito⁴² in adopting the indivisible quantity as a principle of individuation against Thomas' designated matter.⁴³ Brito had reduced the designated matter principle to quantitative accident in his *Quaestiones super Metaphysica V*, 12:⁴⁴ “duo individua solum different secundum accidentis”.⁴⁵ Thus, in the same vein of the reduction of designated matter, Thomas is included among philosophers who considered mere matter (*ὕλη ἀπλῶς*) as a *principium individuationis* in Scholarios' *In de ente et essentia* (1440–1445⁴⁶). However, it is pointed out that Thomas' principle was the designated matter (*materia signata/ὕλη σεσημασμένη*).⁴⁷

Considering the structure of Mark's syllogism one can trace the basic parts of a *quaestio*. Indeed, Mark's *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 1–4⁴⁸ corresponds to the *Argumentum* of a Scholastic *quaestio*, since here Mark unfolds the rival's arguments. There follow Mark's objections to the Latin arguments in l. 5–19,⁴⁹ which correspond to the *Sed*

⁴⁰ Podskalsky 1974d, 317; Monfasani 2011b, 165 (and n. 24). Interestingly enough, Scholarios refers to the *divisio per materiam* (κατὰ τὴν ὕλην διαιρεσίς) in his *Translatio Thomae Aquinatis commentarii in Aristotelis De physico audito*, 10, 147–150, ed. OCGS, VIII, Paris 1936, p. 194, 22–25: “Ἄλλ’ οἱ Πλατωνικοί, θεωροῦντες ὅπως ἐν ἐνὶ εἴδει πολλὰ διακρίνονται ἄτομα κατὰ τὴν τῆς ὕλης διαιρεσιν, ἔθεντο τὸ μὲν ἐν ἐκ τοῦ μέρους τοῦ εἴδους, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ τοῦ ποιεῖν· τὰ δὲ δύο ἐκ τοῦ μέρους τῆς ὕλης, ἡτις ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ τοῦ πάσχειν.” This translation was conducted before 1438 (Tinnefeld 2002c, 518). For the text of Thomas, *In Physica*, lib. 1, l. 11, n. 13, see ed. Leonina, *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, vol. II: *Commentaria in octo libros Physicorum Aristotelis*, Roma 1884, p. 39.

⁴¹ Tinnefeld 2002c, 519.

⁴² Ebbesen 2001, 456, n. 16.

⁴³ Scholarios, *Prolegomena*, 12, 115–123; 144–145, ed. OCGS, VII, p. 77, 18–26; p. 78, 8–9. Kappes 2013a, 86–87.

⁴⁴ For the text, see Ebbesen 2001, 460, n. 16.

⁴⁵ As Kappes 2013a, 89, n. 71 has stated, such a view is based on Thomas' *ST*, Ia, q. 29, a. 2, ad 3, p. 330 Leonina, where it is held that the definition is based on the principles of the species, not the individual principles. Cf. also Thomas' *Super De causis*, l. 9, ed. H. D. Saffrey, *Sancti Thomae de Aquino Super librum De causis expositio* (Textus Philosophici Friburgenses, 4/5), Fribourg-Louvain 1954, p. 65, 16–p. 66, 7, where form is praised as the principle of individuation. Mark may have in mind the former passages, while Aquinas' commentary on the *Liber de causis* is unknown to have been available to Mark. For the variety of interpretation of Thomas' principle of individuation (especially with respect to the *Liber de causis*) see Wippel 2000, 372–374.

⁴⁶ Tinnefeld 2002c, 518.

⁴⁷ In *De ente et essentia*, 53, 39–46, ed. OCGS, VI, Paris 1933, p. 235, 20–27: “Οσοι δὲ τὴν ὕλην ἀπλῶς αἰτίαν ἀπεφήναντο τῆς ἀτομότητος εἶναι, τὸν Φιλόσοφον παρῆγον ἐν πέμπτῳ τῶν *Μετὰ τὰ φυσικά* λέγοντα ἐν ἀριθμῷ εἶναι ὅν τὴν ὕλην μία ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ αὐτή ἀριθμῷ. Ἐντεῦθεν γάρ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν φασι βούλεσθαι τὴν κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐνότητα διὰ τὴν ὕλην ἐν τοῖς πράγμασι γίνεσθαι· τὸ δὲ ἄτομον τοιοῦτον ἐστὶ τῷ εἶναι ἐν ἀριθμῷ. Ταύτης δὲ τῆς δόξης καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος οὗτος εἶναι δοκεῖ, πλὴν οὐχ ἀπλῶς, λέγων τὴν ὕλην, ὡς ἐκεῖνοι, τῆς ἀτομότητος ἀρχήν, ἀλλὰ τὴν γε σεσημασμένην...”; Kappes 2013a, 89–90.

⁴⁸ *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 1–4, p. 85, 18–21 Petit.

⁴⁹ *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 5–19, p. 85, 22–36 Petit.

contra of a quaestio. Then Mark unfolds his argumentation in l. 20–144.⁵⁰ In fact, this part corresponds to the *Corpus of a quaestio*. Notably, in the beginning of his reasoning against matter and opposition as principles of distinction, Mark uses the verbal adjective *σκεπτέον*,⁵¹ in concordance with the relevant use of *considerandum est* of a Thomistic *quaestio*.⁵² Additionally, Mark utilized such a development in his *Epistula ad Isidorum*,⁵³ as already pointed out.⁵⁴ Mark clearly joins the stream of several late Byzantine scholars, who considered the scholastic *quaestio* as an appropriate model for discussion.⁵⁵

Let us now turn to Bessarion's reply, who starts by ironically addressing his rival: Mark was not the first to attack the Thomistic distinction of beings,⁵⁶ since Barlaam the Calabrian⁵⁷ and Nilus Kabasilas⁵⁸ had argued against it. Thus, Mark reproduces their arguments, allegedly for the worse.⁵⁹ Bessarion was aware of the successive stages of the discussion upon this issue and points out that Demetrios Kydones had sufficiently replied to Kabasilas on the issue, who based himself on Barlaam's text.⁶⁰ Hence, Bessarion will not address the universal application of the Thomistic principles of distinction, already addressed by Kydones.⁶¹ Apart from Barlaam's and Nilus' texts noted above, here Bessarion refers to Kydones' defence of the use of syllogisms in Theology, which form a *ratio universalis* (*λόγος καθολικός*) applicable both to Divinity and creation, as unfolded in his unedited⁶² *Defensio Thomae Aquinatis*.⁶³

⁵⁰ *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 20–144, p. 86, 1–p. 89, 12 Petit.

⁵¹ *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 20; 49, p. 86, 1; 30 Petit.

⁵² E. g. *De spiritualibus creaturis*, a. 1 co., ed. J. Cos, *Sancti Thomae de Aquino opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, vol. XXIV, 2, Romae 2000, p. 11, 287–289: “Unde ad huius veritatis inquisitionem ne in ambiguo procedamus, considerandum est quid nomine materie significetur.”

⁵³ *Epistula ad Isidorum*, ed. J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota nova*, Paris 1844, 349, 6–362, 29.

⁵⁴ J. A. Demetracopoulos 2011c, 368, n. 327; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2012f, 343.

⁵⁵ For these authors and the relevant passages, see J. A. Demetracopoulos 2012f, 334–344.

⁵⁶ SG, IV, 24, 8, p. 294, n. 3612 Pera, Marc, Caramello, vol. III; ST, Ia q. 36 a. 2 co., p. 377 Leonina.

⁵⁷ *Contra Latinos* (Tractatus A), IV, 21, 186–204, p. 570, 9–27 Fyrigos.

⁵⁸ *De processione Spiritus sancti*, 1, 79, 1–12, p. 250, 28–p. 252, 10 Candal.

⁵⁹ *Refutatio*, 7, coll. 193C–196A Migne.

⁶⁰ Cf. Scholarios' relevant reference in his *Responsio*, VI (XIII), 69–73, p. 499, 31–35 OCGS, III: “Κυδώνης δέ τις συνηγορίαν τῷ Θωμᾷ χαριζόμενος ούδέν τι δυναμένας τάς ἀντιλογίας ταύτας ίκανῶς ἀποδείκνυσιν, ὥστε καὶ μηδένα λοιπὸν εὑρεθῆναι μέχρι τοῦ νῦν τὴν συνηγορίαν ἐκείνην ἐλέγχοντα, ζήλω τῆς ἀληθείας ἡ φειδοῖ τῆς τοῦ Καβάσιλα δόξης τοσαύτην συμφορὰν πεπονθίας.”

⁶¹ *Refutatio*, 7, col. 196A–B Migne.

⁶² The editio princeps of this text is being prepared by D. Searby (Stockholm) under the Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus Project (Series altera: Thomas de Aquino a Byzantinis receptus, vol. I: *Demetrii Cydonis Defensio Sancti Thomae Aquinatis adversus Nilum Cabasilam*); cf. <https://www.rhul.ac.uk/hellenic-institute/Research/Thomas.htm> and <http://www.labarts.upatras.gr/dimitr/index1.html> (date of access: 06/03/2017); Searby 2012.

⁶³ Demetrios Kydones, *Defensio Thomae Aquinatis*, Vat. Gr. 614, f. 114v, l. 30–115r, l. 15: “(f. 114v) ... ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸ μὴ ὑπ' ἄλλην ἐπιστήμην τὴν θεολογίαν τελεῖν, ἡς ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ἐν ταῖς ἔσωτης ἀποδείξει

Bessarion will focus on the arguments introduced by Mark himself, in order to demonstrate Mark's deficiency in philosophy. Bessarion accuses Mark of denying *materia prima* as a principle of individuation, which is actually irrelevant, since the *materia formata* should be under discussion.⁶⁴ Apparently, Bessarion does not seem to recognize the Scotist background of Mark's argumentation. This is not unexpected, since not only could Bessarion not read Latin at that time,⁶⁵ but also "he never gained more than a superficial knowledge of non-Thomistic Scholastic philosophy and theology".⁶⁶

On the other hand, Bessarion seems to develop his argumentation based on *ST*, I^a, q. 29, a. 2, ad 3,⁶⁷ where Thomas concentrates on the matter-form combination at the moment of "individuation", reducing his principle to *this matter and this form (ex hac materia et ex hac forma)*, out of which hypostasis arises. Such a view falls under the first sequence of Thomistic explanation of individuation, where the "order in being" gives existence the first place.⁶⁸ In this aspect, "the form remains prior to the

χρήσεται, ούδε τοῦτο κωλύσει τὸ περὶ Θεοῦ διαλέγεσθαι· καὶ γάρ καὶ ἡ ἐνταῦθα θεολογία ὑπ' ἄλλην ἐπιστήμην τελεῖ [...] τὴν τῶν μακαρίων ἀνδρῶν, καὶ ἐκ θείας ἀποκαλύψεως αὐτοῖς κατελθοῦσαν [...]. Ὄμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ἄλλοι παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος (f. 115^r) διδαχθέντες τὴν ἐνθεον ἐπιστήμην· οἵς ὥσπερ ἀναποδείκτοις ἀρχαῖς ὁ νῦν θεολογῶν χρώμενος διὰ τούτων ἀκινδύνως ἐπὶ τὰ ζητούμενα βαδιεῖται. Άλλὰ καὶ τοῖς συμπεράσμασιν οὐδὲν λυμανεῖται πρός τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὸ μὴ (ἢ *supra lineam in codice*) καὶ ἄμφω τὰς προτάσεις ταῖς Γραφαῖς διαφρήδην ἔγκεισθαι· κακέθειν ἀμφοτέρος λαμβάνεσθαι· ἀρκεῖ γάρ ἀμφοτέρας εἶναι ἀληθεῖς. Τὸ δὲ τὸν Θεόν μη̄ εἶναι ἐν γένει μηδὲ τι (*τι supra lineam in codice*) εἶναι αὐτοῦ καθολικώτερον ἢ πρότερον οὐκ ἐνποδὼν ἔσται τῇ ἀπόδεξει. Ἔτι γάρ πολλὰ τῶν δυτῶν καθολικωτέρῳ λόγῳ, ἢ ὁ Θεός νοούμενα παρ' ἡμῶν [...] ἀπέρ ὡς ἐπὶ πλέον τοῦ Θεοῦ λεγόμενα νοεῖται παρ' ἡμῶν· καίτοι κατὰ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐν τῷ Θεῷ τὰ αὐτὰ ὄντα· ἀλλ' ὅμως κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν νόησιν, οὐκ ἀντιστέφοντα τῷ Θεῷ, δυνατὸν ἐκείνου κατηγορεῖσθαι· [...] Οὐ τοίνυν ἀσθενῆς ἢ ἀπόδειξις ἐπὶ Θεοῦ, εἰ τοῖς ἐπὶ πλέον λεγομένοις ως καθολικωτέροις καὶ τῇ φύσει ὑστέροις ως ἡμῖν προτέροις καὶ γνωριμοτέροις ἐν ταῖς περὶ τῶν θείων ἀποδείξει χρώμεθα· ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἀξιώματα ἐκ τῶν δυτῶν μὲν εὐλημψένα, δυνάμενα δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν θείων ἀληθῶς ἀξιοῦσθαι· ως τὸ τῆς ἀντιφάσεως ἀξιώμα· καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος καὶ ἄλλα πολλά· ὡν εἴ τις ἀφαιρεῖν ἐπίστατο τὰ διὰ τὴν συμπλοκὴν τῆς ὑλῆς προσγινόμενα πάθη, μόνην δὲ τὴν τελειότητα καὶ τοὺς λόγους τῶν πραγμάτων καταλιμπάνειν, οὐ ψεύσεται καὶ ἐπὶ Θεοῦ ταῦτα ἀξιῶν· τοῦ γάρ τρόπου καθ' ὃν ἐν τοῖς γενητοῖς ἔστι τι περιαιριομένου, ὁ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ λόγος τούτων καταλείπεται μόνος, ὃς ἀληθεύων ἀληθὲς ποιήσει καὶ τὸ συμπέρασμα· ὥστε καὶ θεολογικὴν ἔξεσται τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἐκείνην καλεῖν."

⁶⁴ *Refutatio*, 7, col. 196B-C Migne.

⁶⁵ Monfasani 1981, 166 (and n. 5, where the relevant bibliography is cited); Monfasani 2011b, 166.

⁶⁶ Monfasani 2011b, 166.

⁶⁷ *ST*, I^a, q. 29, a. 2, ad 3, p. 330 Leonina. For the text, see n. 26. Bessarion may also consider *SG*, II, 40, 3; 49, 4, ed. C. Pera, D. P. Marc, D. P. Caramello, *S. Thomae Aquinatis "Liber de veritate catholicae fidei contra errores infidelium" seu "Summa contra Gentiles"*, vol. II, Taurini-Romae 1961, p. 156, n. 1162; p. 170, n. 1250. Given that at that time Bessarion could read only Greek (see n. 65), his Thomistic references regard Thomas Graecus' text. For the reception of Thomas in Bessarion's works, see (forthcoming) Athanasopoulos n.d.; (forthcoming) Athanasopoulos 2017b.

⁶⁸ Owens 1994, 186. The other sequence explains the individuation on the basis of the reverse order, where quantitative or designated matter (= *materia signata*) has conceptually priority as the principle of distinction (Owens 1994, 186–187).

matter it actuates, as well as to the dimensive quantity that marks the matter off into separate portions in the three dimensions required by the thing's nature".⁶⁹ In this vein, Bessarion defends informed matter (i. e. the combination of matter and form) as a *principium individuationis*. Bessarion feels confident in doing so, since the causality of form in beings derives from Aristotle and sets the *substratum* for Aquinas' development of his principle of individuation.⁷⁰ Yet the Thomistic tradition holds for the *materia signata*.⁷¹ Apparently, Bessarion utilizes an atypical passage in relation to Thomas' principle of *materia signata*, focusing on an unemphasized aspect of the development of the Thomistic *principium individuationis*.⁷²

To support his statement, Bessarion mentions the different terms ascribed to informed matter by Aristotle (*έσχάτη, προσεχής, κατ' ἀναλογίαν ὅλη*) in his *Metaphysica*, VII 16, 1035b 27–31⁷³ and VIII 8, 1045b 17–20,⁷⁴ and *Physica*, I 7, 191a 7–12,⁷⁵ and by the Latins (*materia secunda*).⁷⁶ The provenance of the term *materia secunda* is typically Scholastic,⁷⁷ but tracing Bessarion's specific source is trivial for our purposes. Then, Bessarion explains the term *κατ' ἀναλογίαν ὅλη*, based on Aristotle's specific passage of *Physica*. His conclusion is that the *distinctio per materiam* is valid only in the material objects.⁷⁸ Therefore, he states, Mark's charge against Thomas that he applied this distinction to all beings in general is unfounded, since his position is clear and in accordance with Aristotle: it is a distinction valid only in material objects.⁷⁹ This is supported by several passages from Aristotle's *Metaphysica*,⁸⁰ on which the

⁶⁹ Owens 1994, 186.

⁷⁰ Owens 1994, 176–177; 185; 188.

⁷¹ A search via the "Index Thomisticus" in www.corpusthomisticum.org (date of access: 06/03/2017) reveals that the concordances of *materia signata* and *materia formata* to the Thomistic corpus are 29 to 0.

⁷² Owens 1994, 185.

⁷³ *Metaphysica*, VII 16, 1035b 27–31, ed. W. D. Ross, *Aristotle's Metaphysics*, vol. II, Oxford 1970 (repr. of 1953; 1924): "Ο δ' ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὁ ἄποις καὶ τὰ οὕτως ἐπὶ τῶν καθ' ἔκαστα, καθόλου δέ, οὐκ ἔστιν ούσια ἀλλὰ σύνολόν τι ἐκ τουδὶ τοῦ λόγου καὶ τησδιὸς τῆς ὅλης ὡς καθόλου· καθ' ἔκαστον δ' ἐκ τῆς ἔσχάτης ὅλης ὁ Σωκράτης ἥδη ἔστιν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀλλων ὄμοιών τινων·

⁷⁴ *Metaphysica*, VIII 8, 1045b 17–20 Ross: "Ἐστι δ', ὥστερ εἴρηται, ἡ ἔσχάτη ὅλη καὶ ἡ μορφὴ ταύτῳ καὶ ἔν, δυνάμει, τὸ δὲ ἐνέργειᾳ, ὥστε δύοιον τὸ ζητεῖν τοῦ ἐνὸς τί αἴτιον καὶ τοῦ ἔν εἶναι."

⁷⁵ *Physica*, I 7, 191a 7–12, ed. W. D. Ross, *Aristotelis Physica*, Oxford 1966 (repr. of 1950): "Η δὲ ὑποκειμένη φύσις ἐπιστητὴ κατ' ἀναλογίαν. Ως γὰρ πρὸς ἀνδριάντα χαλκὸς ἡ πρὸς κλίνην ξύλον ἡ πρὸς τῶν ἄλλων τι τῶν ἔχοντων μορφὴν [ἡ ὅλη καὶ] τὸ ἄμφορον ἔχει πρὶν λαβεῖν τὴν μορφὴν, οὕτως αὗτη πρὸς ούσιαν ἔχει καὶ τὸ τόδε τι καὶ τὸ ὄν."

⁷⁶ *Refutatio*, 7, col. 196C Migne.

⁷⁷ Catan 1981, 37; Yu 2003, 89.

⁷⁸ *Refutatio*, 7, col. 196C Migne.

⁷⁹ *Refutatio*, 7, col. 196C-D Migne. Cf. Thomas' SG, IV, 24, 8, p. 294, n. 3612 Pera, Marc, Caramello, vol. III; ST, I^a, q. 36, a. 2, co., p. 377 Leonina.

⁸⁰ *Metaphysica*, V 8, 1016a 24–28; V 12, 1018a 5–6; V 12, 1018a 9–10; VII 16, 1035b 30–31; X 6, 1054b 15–17; XII 2, 1069b 26–32 Ross.

material distinction is based.⁸¹ Bessarion supplements these quotations with Aristotle's interpreters, in order to show that they are in the same vein,⁸² i. e. Ps.-Alexander Aphrodisiensis' *Quaestiones et solutiones*⁸³ and *De anima libri mantissa*,⁸⁴ Alexander of Aphrodisias' *De Anima*,⁸⁵ and Themistius' *Paraphrasis in De anima*.⁸⁶

Subsequently, Bessarion addresses Mark's statement that the species (i. e. form) is not the cause of actuality in corporeal composites.⁸⁷ Bessarion agrees that such a view would claim some truth, if Mark had focused on the species/form dependent on matter; still, he refuted the actuality of every species/form. Nevertheless, all the philosophers favor the opposite: Even the inseparable species/form *per se* is the cause and principle of actuality, as it is also the cause of actuality in composites.⁸⁸ Indeed, Plato, Aristotle and their followers attest that the species/form arranges, decorates, and designates the matter.⁸⁹ Bessarion is aware of the fact that there is a long tradition of passages supporting this view.⁹⁰

Bessarion concludes, ironically, that Mark's ignorance of the above passages led him to reject the species (form) as the cause of actuality and the matter as the cause of distinction. Contrariwise, he introduced the *divisio per materiam*. Nevertheless, given that division is in fact distinction, Mark argued that the distinction is the cause of distinction – a quite unusual view in philosophical enquiries.⁹¹ Most probably, here, Bessarion took the opportunity to reply to Mark's attempt to relate the terms *διαιρεσίς*

⁸¹ *Refutatio*, 7, col. 196D–197B Migne.

⁸² *Refutatio*, 7, coll. 197B–200A Migne.

⁸³ *Quaestiones et solutiones*, 3, 13–17; 25, 27–29, p. 7, 32–38, 4; p. 40, 3–5 Bruns.

⁸⁴ *De anima libri mantissa*, p. 168, 35–p. 169, 2 ed. I. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora* (CAG, suppl. II, 1), Berlin 1887.

⁸⁵ *De Anima*, p. 10, 24–26; p. 85, 16–17 Bruns.

⁸⁶ *Paraphrasis in De anima*, VI (III 5), 201–203, ed. R. Heinze, *Themistii in libros Aristotelis de anima paraphrasis* (CAG, V, 3), Berlin 1899, p. 103, 26–28.

⁸⁷ *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 37–42, p. 86, 18–23 Petit.

⁸⁸ *Refutatio*, 7, col. 200B Migne. Cf. Thomas' ST, Ia, q. 29, a. 2, ad 3, p. 330 Leonina, where species is equivalent to form.

⁸⁹ *Refutatio*, 7, 200C Migne.

⁹⁰ Plato, *Timaeus*, 53a 2–7, ed. J. Burnet, *Platonis opera*, vol. IV, Oxford 1968 (repr. of 1902); Incertus auctor, *Prolegomena in philosophiam Platonicam*, 27, 24–28, ed. L. G. Westerink, J. Trouillard, A. Ph. Segonds, *Prolégomènes à la Philosophie de Platon*, Paris 1990, p. 42, l. 1–5; Aristotle, *Physica*, IV 2, 209b 2–4 Ross; *Metaphysica*, V 10, 1017a 4–6 Ross; Themistius, *In Aristotelis Physica paraphrasis*, I 9, 55–59, ed. H. Schenkl, *Themistii in Aristotelis Physica paraphrasis* (CAG, V, 2), Berlin 1900, p. 33, 23–27; Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, II, 30A, ed. E. Diehl, *Procli Diadochi in Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, vol. I, Leipzig 1903, p. 381, 3–6; Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum libros commentaria*, I 9, 214–218; 298–300, ed. H. Diels, *Simplicii in Aristotelis Physicorum libros octo commentaria*, vol. I (CAG, IX), Berlin 1882, p. 249, 5–9; p. 251, 20–22; Ioannes Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Physicorum libros commentaria*, I 6, 340–342; I 9, 166–167, ed. H. Vitelli, *Ioannis Philoponi in Aristotelis Physicorum libros octo commentaria*, vol. I (CAG, XVI), Berlin 1887, p. 138, 5–7; p. 187, 26–27.

⁹¹ *Refutatio*, 7, col. 200C-D Migne.

and διάκρισις.⁹² Then Bessarion turns to his rival's criticism on the *distinctio per oppositionem*.⁹³

I now sum up our discussion: In order to oppose the *principium individuationis*, as discussed in Thomas' two *Summae*, Mark takes into account his predecessors in this discussion, i. e. Barlaam and Nilus Kabasilas. Yet, Mark draws his argumentation from Scotus, in order to support the *divisio per materiam* (διαίρεσις κατὰ τὴν ὕλην) as a principle of individuation. Mark's utilization of Scotus' arguments became possible most probably thanks to Scholarios' help. Yet all these sources are undeclared. Mark's argumentation is developed in the form of a Scholastic *quaestio*, which indicates his view on this form as an appropriate model for discussion.

Bessarion's approach, on the other hand, seems more transparent, since he points out the successive stages of this discussion and states his sources; namely Aristotle (mainly), Alexander and Ps.-Alexander of Aphrodisias, Themistius and Demetrios Kydones. Bessarion, hardly a subtle philosopher, seems to ignore the Scotist critique on Thomas' principle. On the contrary, he focuses on *ST*, I^a, q. 29, a. 2, ad 3, an otherwise oft-ignored Thomistic source on the issue. True, in considering the Aristotelian background of this passage, Bessarion does correctly state that Thomas' principle of individuation is clearly the *materia formata*.

Mark's research for anti-Thomistic sources on the use of the *principium individuationis* resulted in the reception of the Scotist up-to-date and vigorous argumentation *ad hoc*. On the other hand, Bessarion's thesis seems more "conventional", but – thanks to his erudition – is well grounded in many reputable sources.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abbreviations

CAG	Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, ed. H. Diels et al., Berlin 1882–1909, 33 vols.
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca, ed. P. van Deun, Turnhout-Leuven 1977–, 83 vols.
CFDS	Concilium Florentinum. Documenta et Scriptores, Series A–B, ed. G. Hoffmann, M. Candal et al., Roma 1940–1977, 21 vols.
OCGS	<i>Œuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios</i> , ed. M. Jugie, L. Petit, X. A. Sideridès, Paris 1929–1935, 8 vols.
PO	Patrologia Orientalis, R. Graffin, F. Nau et al., Paris-Leuven 1903–, 53 vols.

⁹² *Capita Syllogistica*, 25, 96–99, p. 88, 1–4 Petit: "καὶ μὴν καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦνομα συγγενὲς ἡ διαίρεσις ἔχουσα τῇ διακρίσει, δῆλον ἡμῖν καθίστησιν, ὡς αὐτὴ τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτῇ παρέχεται."

⁹³ *Refutatio*, 7, coll. 200D–204D Migne.

Primary Sources

Acta Graeca, ed. J. Gill, *Quae supersunt actorum Graecorum concilii Florentini* (CFDS, Ser. B, vol. V, 2), Roma 1953.

Alexander Aphrodisiensis, *De Anima*, ed. I. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora* (CAG, suppl. II, 1), Berlin 1887, 1–100.

Ps.-Alexander Aphrodisiensis, *De anima libri mantissa*, ed. I. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora* (CAG, suppl. II, 1), Berlin 1887, 101–186.

Ps.-Alexander Aphrodisiensis, *Quaestiones et solutiones*, ed. I. Bruns, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora* (CAG, suppl. II, 2), Berlin 1892, 1–163.

Aristoteles, *Metaphysica*, ed. W. D. Ross, *Aristotle's Metaphysics*, vol. II, Oxford 1970 (repr. of 1953; 1924).

Aristoteles, *Physica*, ed. W. D. Ross, *Aristotelis Physica*, Oxford 1966 (repr. of 1950).

Barlaam Calaber, *Contra Latinos*, ed. A. Fyrigos, *Barlaam Calabro. Operc Contro I Latini*, vol. II, Studi e Testi 348, Città del Vaticano 1998.

Bessarion, *Refutatio Marci Ephesini*, ed. J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*, vol. CLXI, Parisiis 1866, coll. 137–244. [Refutatio]

Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio*, ed. P. C. Balić et al., *Ioannis Duns Scoti opera omnia*, vol. VII, Civitas Vaticana 1973. [Ord.]

Gennadius Scholarius, *Prolegomena in Logicam et in Porphyrii Isagogen*, ed. OCGS, vol. VII, Paris 1936, 7–113. [Prolegomena]

Gennadius Scholarius, *Responsio ad syllogismos Marci Ephesi de processu Spiritus sancti*, ed. OCGS, vol. III, Paris 1930, 476–538. [Responsio]

Gennadius Scholarius, *Traductio et Commentarium in De ente et essentia*, ed. OCGS, vol. VI, Paris 1933, 154–321. [In De ente et essentia]

Gennadius Scholarius, *Translatio Thomae Aquinatis commentarii in Aristotelis De physico audito*, ed. OCGS, vol. VIII, Paris 1936, 163–254.

Incertus auctor, *Prolegomena in philosophiam Platonicam*, ed. L. G. Westerink, J. Trouillard, A. Ph. Segonds, *Prolégomènes à la Philosophie de Platon*, Paris 1990.

Ioannes Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Physicorum libros commentaria*, ed. H. Vitelli, *Ioannis Philoponi in Aristotelis Physicorum libros octo commentaria*, vol. I (CAG, XVI), Berlin 1887.

Marcus Eugenicus, *Capita syllogistica adversus Latinos de Spiritus sancti ex Patre processione*, ed. L. Petit, *Marci Eugenici Metropolitae Ephesi opera anti-unionistica* (CFDS, Ser. A, vol. X, 2), Roma 1977, 60–107. [Capita Syllogistica]

Marcus Eugenicus, *Epistula ad Isidorum*, ed. J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota nova*, Paris 1844, 349–362.

Marcus Eugenicus, *Oratio prima de pugne purgatorio*, ed. L. Petit, *Documents relatifs au Concile de Florence* (PO, 15), 1927, 39–60.

Michael Ephesius, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica commentaria*, ed. M. Hayduck, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis metaphysica commentaria* (CAG, I), Berlin 1891.

Nilus Cabasilas, *De processione Spiritus sancti*, ed. E. Candal, *Nilus Cabasilas et theologia S. Thomae de processione Spiritus sancti*, Studi e Testi 116, Città del Vaticano 1945, 188–385.

Plato, *Timaeus*, ed. J. Burnet, *Platonis opera*, vol. IV, Oxford 1968 (repr. of 1902), St III.17a–92c.

Posidonius, *Fragmenta*, ed. W. Theiler, *Posidonios. Die Fragmente*, vol. I, Berlin 1982.

Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, ed. E. Diehl, *Procli Diadochi in Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, vol. I, Leipzig 1903.

Radulpus Brito, *Quaestiones super Metaphysica*, ed. S. Ebbesen, “Radulphus Brito on the Metaphysics”, in J. A. Aertsen, K. Emery, A. Speer (ed.), *Nach der Verurteilung von 1277* (Miscellanea Mediaevalia, vol. 28), Berlin-New York 2001, 456–492.

Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum libros commentaria*, ed. H. Diels, *Simplicii in Aristotelis Physicorum libros octo commentaria*, vol. I (CAG, IX), Berlin 1882.

Themistius, *Paraphrasis in De anima*, ed. R. Heinze, *Themistii in libros Aristotelis de anima paraphrasis* (CAG, V, 3), Berlin 1899.

Themistius, *In Aristotelis Physica paraphrasis*, ed. H. Schenkl, *Themistii in Aristotelis Physica paraphrasis* (CAG, V, 2), Berlin 1900.

Thomas Aquinas, *De spiritualibus creaturis*, ed. J. Cos, *Sancti Thomae de Aquino opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, vol. XXIV, 2, Romae 2000.

Thomas Aquinas, *In Physica*, ed. *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, vol. II: *Commentaria in octo libros Physicorum Aristotelis*, Roma 1884.

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra Gentiles*, ed. C. Pera, D. P. Marc, D. P. Caramello, *S. Thomae Aquinatis "Liber de veritate catholicae fidei contra errores infidelium" seu "Summa contra Gentiles"*, vol. II-III, Taurini-Romae 1961. [SG]

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, ed. *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, vol. IV: *Pars prima "Summae Theologiae"*, a quaestione I ad quaestionem XLIX, Roma 1888. [ST]

Thomas Aquinas, *Super De causis*, ed. H. D. Saffrey, *Sancti Thomae de Aquino Super librum De causis expositio* (Textus Philosophici Friburgenses, 4/5), Fribourg-Louvain 1954.

Secondary Sources

Athanasopoulos, P. C. *Loci diversi ex Thomae de Aquino scriptis apud Bessarionis opera. Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca. Appendix to J. Monfasani (ed.), Ioannis Gatti Notata in libro secundo Georgii Trapezuntii "Comparationis Philosophorum"* (forthcoming). Turnhout.

Athanasopoulos, P. C. (2017b). "Ways of Reception of Thomas Graecus and Thomas Latinus in Bessarion's Works". In: *Bessarion's Treasure: Editing, Translating and Interpreting Bessarion's literary heritage*. Ed. by S. Mariev. Byzantinisches Archiv—Series Philosophica, 3. Forthcoming. Berlin and Boston.

Catan, J. R. (1981). *Aristotle. The Collected Papers of Joseph Owens*. New York.

Cross, R. (1999). *Duns Scotus*. Oxford.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2011c). "Palamas Transformed. Palamite Interpretations of the Distinction between God's 'Essence' and 'Energies' in Late Byzantium". In: *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History. 1204–1500*. Ed. by M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel. Leuven, Paris, and Walpole, pp. 263–372.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2012f). "Thomas Aquinas' Impact on Late Byzantine Theology and Philosophy: The Issues of Method or 'Modus Sciendi' and 'Dignitas Hominis'". In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz: Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 36. Berlin and Boston, pp. 333–410.

Di Giovanni, M. and O. Primavesi (2016). "Who wrote Alexander's Commentary on *Metaphysics A?* New Light on the Syro-Arabic Tradition". In: *Aristotle's "Metaphysics" Lambda – New Essays. Proceedings of the 13th Conference of the Karl and Gertrud-Abel Foundation, Bonn, November 28th–December 1st, 2010*. Ed. by C. Horn. Philosophie der Antike, 33. Berlin and Boston, pp. 11–66.

Ebbesen, S. (2001). "Radulphus Brito on the *Metaphysics*". In: *Nach der Verurteilung von 1277*. Ed. by J. A. Aertsen, K. Emery, and A. Speer. Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 28. Berlin and New York, pp. 456–492.

Faitanin, P. (2002). "La 'haecceitas' en Juan Duns Escoto". In: *Aquinate 8*, pp. 3–14.

Gill, J. (1961). *The Council of Florence*. Cambridge.

Gracia, J. J. E. (1984). *Introduction to the Problem of Individuation in the Early Middle Ages*. München and Wien.

Gracia, J. J. E. (1994). "Introduction: The Problem of Individuation". In: *Individuation in Scholasticism. The Later Middle Ages and the Counter-Reformation, 1150–1650*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia. New York, pp. 1–20.

Kappes, C. W. (2013a). "The Latin Sources of the Palamite Theology of George-Gennadius Scholarius". In: *When East met West. The Reception of Latin Theological and Philosophical Thought in Late Byzantium. London, 11–12 June 2012*. Ed. by J. A. Demetracopoulos and C. Dendrinos. Nicolaus 1, pp. 71–114.

Kappes, C. W. (2014a). "A Latin Defence of Mark of Ephesus at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–39)". In: *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 59.1–4, pp. 161–230.

Kappes, C. W. (2016). "Mark of Ephesus, the Council of Florence, and the Roman Papacy". In: *Primacy in the Church. The Office of Primacy and the Authority of Councils*. Ed. by J. Chryssavgis. Vol. 1. New York, pp. 109–150.

Keck, D. (1998). *Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages*. New York and Oxford.

Minges, P. (1930). *Ioannis Duns Scoti doctrina philosophica et theologica*. Vol. 1. Ad Claras Aquas (Quaracchi).

Monfasani, J. (1981). "Bessarion Latinus". In: *Rinascimento* 21, pp. 165–209.

Monfasani, J. (2011b). "The Pro-Latin Apologetics of the Greek Émigrés to Quattrocento Italy". In: *Byzantine Theology and its Philosophical Background*. Ed. by A. Rigo, P. Ermilov, and M. Trizio. Bučántioç, 4. Turnhout, pp. 160–186.

Noone, T. B. (2003). "Universals and Individuation". In: *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus*. Ed. by T. Williams. Cambridge, pp. 100–128.

Owens, J. (1994). "Thomas Aquinas". In: *Individuation in Scholasticism. The Later Middle Ages and the Counter-Reformation, 1150–1650*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia. New York, pp. 173–194.

Podskalsky, G. (1974d). "Die Rezeption der thomistischen Theologie bei Gennadios II. Scholarios (ca. 1403–1472)". In: *Theologie und Philosophie* 49, pp. 305–323.

Searby, D. (2012). "Demetrios Kydones: Defending Thomas or Defending Himself?" In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz: Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 36. Berlin and Boston, pp. 439–451.

Tinnefeld, F. (2002c). "Georgios Gennadios Scholarios". In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition, vol. II: XIIe–XIXe s.* Ed. by C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello. Turnhout, pp. 477–549.

Wippel, J. F. (2000). *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas. From Finite Being to Uncreated Being*. Washington.

Wolter, A. B. (1994). "John Duns Scotus". In: *Individuation in Scholasticism. The Later Middle Ages and the Counter-Reformation, 1150–1650*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia. New York, pp. 271–298.

Yu, J. (2003). *The Structure of Being in Aristotle's Metaphysics*. The New Synthese Historical Library. Texts and Studies in the History of Philosophy, 52. Dordrecht.

Irini Balcoyannopoulou

New Evidence on the Manuscript Tradition and on the Latin and Greek Background to George Scholarius' *In “De Interpretatione”*

In 1936, the seventh volume of Martin Jugie's edition of Scholarius' writings was published,¹ comprising, *inter alia*, a handbook of Logic, which analysed Porphyry's *Isagoge* and Aristotle's *Categories* and *De Interpretatione* (namely, what the Scholastics called *ars vetus*), prefaced by a dedicatory letter to Emperor Constantine XI Palaeologus. The editor's Introduction to Scholarius' *Ars Vetus* provides some evidence regarding the following issues: (i) the contents of the edition, (ii) the date of the Commentary,² (iii) the author's aim, (iv) the sources of the commentary, (v) its division, (vi) its method, (vii) the content of the commentary (mainly on basis of the author's introductory letter), and (viii) a very brief description of Scholarius' autograph manuscripts, without however establishing any relation between them.

Jugie's skill in deciphering intricacies in Scholarius' hand in the autographs is admirable. Nevertheless, he often does not specify whether a certain reading occurs in the running text or in the margins of the manuscript.³ Furthermore, his edition lacks an *apparatus fontium* and *loci paralleli*. Such defects are understandable to some extent, since the editor had a considerable amount of work to do on his own in a relatively short time.⁴ However, the most important thing that he missed, as recent scholarship has shown and will be further shown here, is that Scholarius' *Commentary* is, almost exclusively, a compilation of certain partly known and partly unknown Latin Scholastic logical handbooks. This renders Jugie's picture of Scholarius' *Ars Vetus* as well as any philological discussion based exclusively on the textual status and the data provided in his edition⁵ inevitably outdated.

1 L. Petit, X.-A. Sideridès, M. Jugie, *Γενναδίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἀπαντα τὰ εὑρισκόμενα. Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. VII, Paris 1936.

2 Jugie (Petit/Sideridès/Jugie, 1936, II; vol. VIII, 16*) dates Scholarius' commentary to 1433/35. Cf. a recent discussion of the date in J. A. Demetracopoulos 2017c, 12.

3 For example, Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 263, 1–4 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie (“Ταύτας δὲ καὶ ἀμφοτέρας τὰς διαιρέσεις συντομά χρώμενος ὅμοι τίθησι καὶ ἀδιακρίτως, ἀλλὰ δεῖ μᾶλλον διακρίνοντας λέγειν, ὅτι ἡ ἀπόφανσις ἡ ἐστι μία ἀπλῶς, ἡ συνδέσμω μίσται καὶ ἡ ἀπλῶς μία ἡ καταφατική ἐστιν ἡ ἀποφατική”) is a marginal addition by Scholarius in Vat. gr. 2223, f. 161r. Jugie does not mention this in his *apparatus criticus*.

4 J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010c, 86.

5 For example, see Tavardon 1976; Ierodiakonou 2011.

1 The manuscript tradition

1.1 The autographs

There are four autograph manuscripts containing Scholarius' *Ars Vetus*: Vaticanus gr. 2223, Barberinus gr. 124, Parisinus gr. 1941, and Mutinensis 50. Jugie used Vaticanus, Parisinus and Mutinensis, considering the Barberinus to be an exact copy of the first one.⁶ Nevertheless, this manuscript needs to be included in a complete critical edition, too, because it contains a revised text. For example, additions and corrections found in the margins of the Vatican codex are featured in the main text of the Barberinus; Scholarius copied some of the notes,⁷ but not all; he also did not reproduce the different renderings of Latin words but chose one of them. There are also certain new corrections in cod. Barberinus, which do not occur in the Vatican manuscript, i. e. mainly additions of articles as well as some words that Scholarius' *calamus* skipped during the translation process. Furthermore, in Barberinus' fol. 181r there is an explicit reference to one of his autographs, where he notes that this certain passage is written in the margins. Indeed, this passage is found in the margins of all the extant manuscripts except Barberinus.

The contents of the manuscripts run as follows:

- a) Vaticanus gr. 2223: i) f. 1r–4r: Dedication letter to Constantine XI Palaeologus; ii) f. 5r–68v: Prolegomena to *Logic* and to Porphyry's *Isagoge*; iii) f. 69r–146r: Commentary on the *Categories*; iv) f. 147r–212r: Commentary on the *De Interpretatione*.⁸

⁶ Petit/Sideridès/Jugie, 1936, V, n.1.

⁷ As can be seen in cod. Vat. gr., f. 8r (cf. Schol., *Ars Vet.*, p. 13 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie), Scholarius copied two notes concerning the aims of logic and grammar in all of the manuscripts: (a) “Σημείωσαι, ὅτι ἡ μὲν λογικὴ ὑπῆρετεῖ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπιστήμαις ὅσον πρὸς τὸ ἐπίστασθαι, ἡ δὲ γραμματικὴ ὅσον πρὸς τὴν διδασκαλίαν”; (b) “Σημείωσαι, ὅτι ἡ γραμματικὴ διδάσκει ήμᾶς τὸ ὄργανον τοῦ διδάσκειν ὃ δὴ διδάσκειν ἀναγκαιότατόν ἐστι πρὸς τὴν κτήσιν τῆς ἐπιστήμης. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸ ὄργανον τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐστὶν ὃ εὐσύνετος λόγος, ὡς ἐν τῷ *Περὶ αἰσθήσεως καὶ αἰσθητοῦ* λέγεται, διὰ τοῦτο ἡ γραμματικὴ περὶ τούτου τοῦ λόγου οὖσα τοῦ σημαντικοῦ, γέγονεν ἡμῖν ἀναγκαῖα”. This derives from Radpulphus Brito (see Ebbesen and Pinborg 1981–1982, 288 and 299; see also J. A. Demetracopoulos 2017c). Still, he does not transfer to other manuscripts a note concerning the explanation of a passage found in f. 158r (cf. Schol., *Ars Vet.*, p. 258 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie, revised transcription: “Σημείωσαι, ὅτι καλῶς προσέθηκε τῷ ὄρισμῷ τοῦ λόγου τὸ ‘τί τῶν μερῶν αὐτοῦ σημαίνειν κεχωρισμένον’, ὥσπερ εἰδικήν τινα διαφοράν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν δόμομα καὶ τὸ ρῆμα· ίδού γάρ τὸ δόμομα, κἀν ἀπλούν εἴποις κἀν σύνθετον, ἥγουν ἢ τὸ ‘μῆν’ ἢ τὸ ‘ἐπακτροκέλης’, ὅλον μὲν σημαίνει ὅ τι ποτε βούλεται σημαίνειν ἐκάτερον· ἀποκοπέντων δὲ τῶν μερῶν αὐτοῦ, οὔτε τὸ ὅλον σημαίνει λοιπόν, οὔτε τὰ μέρη σημαίνουσιν ὅπερ ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ ἐσήμαινον· οὐδὲ γάρ τὸ ‘ὑς’ σημαίνει τι ἐν τῷ ‘μῆν’·”⁹ Η βέλτιον εἰπεῖν ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἀπλοῖς ὄνόμασι τὰ μέρη, ἢ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς, οὐδὲν σημαίνει· ἐν δὲ τοῖς συνθέτοις σημαίνουσι μὲν ἢ εἰσιν ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ χωρὶς οὐ σημαίνουσιν τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο, ἀλλ’ ἔτερόν τι· τὰ δὲ μέρη τοῦ λόγου καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἔξω αὐτοῦ ταῦτόν τι σημαίνουσιν”).

⁸ See Lilla 1985, 269–272; Cataldi Palau 1995, 61, 70, 88, 93.

- b) Barberinus gr. 124: i) f. 1r–74v: Prolegomena to *Logic* and to Porphyry's *Isagoge*; ii) f. 74v–161v: Commentary on the *Categories*; iii) f. 162r–240r: Commentary on the *De Interpretatione*.⁹
- c) Parisinus gr. 1941: i) f. 1r–3r: Dedication letter to Constantine XI Palaeologus; ii) f. 9r–55r: Prolegomena to Logic and Porphyry's *Isagoge*; iii) f. 55r–103r: Commentary on the *Categories*; iv) f. 104r–145v: Commentary on the *De Interpretatione*; v) f. 146r–146v: a few philosophical fragments written by Scholarius' hand in a different style and time (smaller letters, no margins); vi) f. 147r–178r: Προκόπιου ρήτορος Περὶ τῶν τοῦ δεσπότου Ἰουστίνιανοῦ κτισμάτων, written by a different hand.¹⁰
- d) Mutinensis 50: *Inter alia*: i) f. 7r–9v: Dedication letter to Constantine XI Palaeologus; ii) f. 10r–65r: Commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge*; iii) f. 66r–129r: Commentary on the *Categories*; iv) f. 137r–190r: Commentary on the *De Interpretatione*.¹¹

The above list of manuscripts probably reflects their chronological order. The three latter manuscripts share several similarities; this indicates that the Barberinus played a key role in the creation of the other two – more than the Vaticanus did.

The revision and collation of Vaticanus, Barberinus and Parisinus by Scholarius indicate his effort to produce a perfect, final copy. We find marginal comments and corrections written by his hand at different times, until the creation of codex Mutinensis, some of them common in all, some not. Scholarius revises the text over and over again during a certain period of time. Most of his corrections have to do with translation mistakes (very often, the rendering of grammatical cases), additions for facilitating understanding, personal notes and changes of titles, but with no major corrections in the terminology or syntax. Cod. Mutinensis contains the last and more complete text; it is a manuscript that offers an exposition of the entire Aristotelian Logic except *Analytica posteriora*.

1.2 Other manuscripts

Scholarius' *Ars vetus* is found in two more manuscripts. The first is cod. Escorial gr. 193,¹² a 16th century manuscript written by Nicolaos Mourmouris and Pedro Carnabaca. It contains: i) f. 1r–58v Prolegomena to *Logic* and to Porphyry's *Isagoge*; ii) f. 58v–106v: Commentary on the *Categories*; iii) f. 106v–140v: Commentary on the *De In-*

⁹ Cf. Mercati 1920, 125. There is also a very short description of the content of the manuscript in f. 1r by its 16th century owner Claudio Betti. I am elaborating a better description in my doctoral thesis.

¹⁰ A brief description of the manuscript is offered in Omont 1888, 168.

¹¹ Puntoni 1965, 414–416. I am elaborating a full description of this manuscript in my doctoral thesis.

¹² For a full description of the manuscript see de Andrés 1965, 22–23.

terpretatione; iv) f. 143v–186r: Anonymous scholia on *Analytica priora*¹³ and v) f. 191r–214v: Alexander of Aphrodisias' *Liber de Anima*.

The second is cod. Barberinus gr. 34 (17th century), which is a copy of the Vatican's. It reproduces the main text, without the additions and corrections found in the margins and without the letter to Constantine XI Palaeologus. These manuscripts show that Scholarius' commentary was used by some of his posteriors, even centuries after his death, for teaching and/or studying purposes.

Another testimony is Vaticanus gr. 1777, a 15th century collection of excerpts,¹⁴ most of which come from Scholarius. This manuscript is probably the one used by Bonifacio Bembo for his translation of Scholarius' *Ars vetus* into Latin in the late 15th century.¹⁵

2 Scholarius' aims and method

In his prefatory letter to Constantine XI Palaeologus, Scholarius stresses the importance of the study of logic:

[...] πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιστημῶν κτῆσιν συμβάλλεται καὶ [...] ταύτης ἀγνοουμένης ή μὴ γινωσκομένης ως δεῖ, ἀδύνατον ἡντινοῦν ἐπιστήμην λαβεῖν καὶ ἔχειν καλῶς [...]¹⁶

[Logic] contributes to the acquisition of the other sciences; if ignored or not learned properly, it is impossible to gain knowledge of and comprehend any science.

Being aware of this, he says, he studied it thoroughly, using the best literature on the subject,¹⁷ i. e. both Greek and foremost Latin works.¹⁸ Scholarius stresses that the Latin scholars had read all the works on logic – not only those written in Latin but also Latin translations from Greek and “Arabic and Persian”. For this reason, they acquired a sound knowledge of logic; they could advance the best arguments and draw their own conclusions.¹⁹ That is, he explains, why he decided to rely mostly on Latin writings to compose his own handbook of logic.²⁰

Scholarius explains why he produced this commentary, justifying the “new way” of text explanation and his selection of sources. A decade later (1443/44), Scholarius

¹³ According to Ch. Au. Brandis, *Scholia in Aristotelem*, in ed. Im. Bekker, *Aristotelis opera*, vol. IV, Berolini 1836, p. 139–251, this is a collection of excerpts coming from more than one scholars.

¹⁴ For a description of the manuscript, see P. Canart 1970, 112–116.

¹⁵ Cf. Ebbesen and Pinborg 1981–1982, 314–317.

¹⁶ Schol., *Ars vet.*, 4, 25–28 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

¹⁷ Schol., *Ars vet.*, 3, 2–12 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

¹⁸ Schol., *Ars vet.*, 3, 13–15 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

¹⁹ Schol., *Ars vet.*, 3, 15–30 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

²⁰ Schol., *Ars vet.*, 3, 4–30 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

would address Palaeologus again, in his *Kατὰ τῶν Πλήθωνος ἀποριῶν ἐπ’ Ἀριστοτέλει*, a long refutation of Plethon's *De differentiis*.²¹ In both cases he appeals to the emperor's wisdom in view of the expected reaction by other scholars who would oppose his method in the former work²² and those who would insist on supporting Pletho's arguments against Aristotle in the latter, in spite of the fact that no one before him defended Aristotle in such a true and complete way.²³

Scholarius declares that he wants to set an example for his contemporary and later scholars.²⁴ Although he knows that this attempt is not welcomed by his fellow scholars in Greece, he claims that this work will prove valuable not only to those of them that are wise and seek the truth, but, unexpectedly, to the Latins as well.²⁵

After explaining the differences between the traditional exegetical method of his fellow Byzantines and his own, Scholarius presents the content of his logical courses. It included, he says, four parts, the content of which is based on Porphyry's *Isagoge* and Aristotle's *Categories*, *De Interpretatione*, and *Analytica posteriora*. Concerning the *Analytica posteriora*, he had already translated Thomas Aquinas' *Commentary*.²⁶ Aquinas' exegetical contribution, he explains, had to be shared by those who did not know Latin.²⁷

Scholarius analyses the method and the structure of his *Ars vetus*.

[...] ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν ἐκτρεπόμενοί τε κενοδοξίαν καὶ σοφίας δόξαν ἥκιστα προσποιούμενοι, οὔτε τοὺς ἄλλους ἐλέγχειν οὔτε αὐτὸι ἐπιδείκνυσθαι ἡξιώσαμεν, ἀλλ’ ἡγαπήσαμεν τὰς ἀληθεστέρας ἔξηγήσεις δοκούσας εἶναι τῶν ἐγνωσμένων, ταύτας τιθέναι, οὐδὲν προσδιορίζόμενοι οὐ τέ εἰσι καὶ ὅτου χάριν τῶν ἄλλων πλέον ἐδοκιμάσθησαν.²⁸

In most cases, eschewing vanity and making no pretences of appearing wise, I decided neither to refute others nor to show off, but confined myself to expounding those among the best-known explanations that seemed to me to be truest, without specifying in which text they are found, or for what reason they were approved more than the others.

²¹ Schol., *Kατὰ τῶν Πλήθωνος ἀποριῶν ἐπ’ Ἀριστοτέλει*, ed. L. Petit, X.-A. Sideridès, M. Jugie, *Γενναδίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἀπαντά τὰ εὑρισκόμενα. Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. IV, Paris 1935, pp. 1–116.

²² Schol., *Ars vet.*, 3, 34–4, 6 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

²³ Schol., *Kατὰ τῶν Πλήθωνος ἀποριῶν ἐπ’ Ἀριστοτέλει* 1, 1–10, 14 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

²⁴ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 4, 4–5 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

²⁵ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 6, 6–7 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

²⁶ Schol., *Ars vet.*, 4, 33–34 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie. No manuscript of this translation is extant. Cf. J. A. Demetracopoulos 2014c, 825.

²⁷ Schol., *Ars vet.*, 5, 2–4 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

²⁸ Schol., *Ars vet.*, 5, 28–32 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

He announces that, in a few cases he will mention different opinions concerning the discussed subject and will express his own view,²⁹ whereas in other cases he will discuss the issues briefly and clearly.³⁰

Regarding the structure of his exposition, Scholarius says that he interprets Aristotle's logical texts in a way previously unknown to the Greeks (in fact, mostly based on Thomas Aquinas), namely by dividing his commentary into *lectiones* (ἀναγνώσεις). In these *lectiones*, he says, he firstly introduces the matter (*προθεωρία*) and then offers an outline of the text (ἡ τοῦ γράμματος διάρεσις γενικῶς). Then he provides a detailed division and interpretation of the text (διαιρεῖται τὸ γράμμα εἰδικῶς καὶ ἐρμηνεύεται), and continues “τῷ λατινικῷ τρόπῳ”, using the *quaestio* format.³¹ Explaining the *De Interpretatione*, Scholarius divides it into five parts and fourteen *lectiones*.³² In the

²⁹ For example, in Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 337, 33–339, 6, he opposes Ammonius' opinion on the authenticity of the last part of Aristotle's work by providing his own arguments. (see Schol., *Ars vet.*, 5, 26–28 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie). In a few cases, he defends Aristotle, either in the main text or in the margins. For example, in Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 266, 19–21 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie, he justifies Aristotle for not including in the *De Interpretatione* any analysis of the reason why sometimes many can be one, since this had been explored in *Metaphysics*, Bk. VII and VIII, as a comment on a metaphysical, not a logical issue. Further on, in a marginal note in f. 158r of Vat. gr. 2223, (cf. n. 4), Scholarius expresses his opinion about Aristotle's choice to include in the *De Interpretatione* a clarification of the difference between the parts of simple words and the parts of composed words.

³⁰ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 5, 32–34 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie. For example, Ebbesen and Pinborg 1981–1982, 269, have identified passages abridged from Radulphus Brito in Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 206, 25–207, 2 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie. Likewise, in Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 337, 33–339, 6 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie he reproduces a passage from Ammonius' commentary on the *De Interpretatione* (251, 25–252, 13, ed. A. Busse, *Ammonius in Aristotelis De Interpretatione Commentarius* [CAG 4.5] Berlin 1897, p. 1–272) and expresses his thoughts on the reasons why Ammonius and other scholars challenged the authorship of 23a27–23b (ed. L. Minio-Paluello, *Aristotelis Categoriae et liber De Interpretatione*, Oxonii 1956, p. 69–72). Besides Ammonius, Scholarius refers to Psellus' opinion, (In “*De Int.*”, Oiv r, 22–Ovi r, 41 Manutius), who devoted the last pages of his paraphrasis to show that this passage cannot be genuine.

³¹ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 5, 17–25 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie. On the Late Byzantine reception of the *quaestio* format, see J. A. Demetracopoulos 2012e, 334–344.

³² Aristotle (*De Int.* 16a 1–2 Minio-Paluello) begins his work with stating that he intends to deal with five things: “Πρῶτον δεῖ θέσθαι τί ὄνομα καὶ τί ρῆμα, ἔπειτα τί ἔστιν ἀπόφασις καὶ κατάφασις καὶ ἀπόφανσις καὶ λόγος”, although the actual order is ὄνομα, ρῆμα, λόγος, and ἀπόφανσις, κατάφασις καὶ ἀπόφασις being two types of ἀπόφανσις. Ammonius, the anonymous commentator of Paris. gr. 2064, Leo Magentinus and Psellus used as subtitles the first four of these subject-matters in the first part of their commentaries. Scholarius uses two subtitles, *Περὶ λόγου* (*Ars Vet.*, 256, 2 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie) and *Περὶ ἀπόφανσεως* (*Ars Vet.*, 260, 10 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie), which are found only in cod. Mutinensis 50. The division of the *De Interpretatione* into five chapters or parts is found in Greek commentaries; it goes back to Ammonius, probably even to Proclus (see L. Tarán, *Anonymous Commentary on Aristotle's De Interpretatione* (codex Parisinus Graecus 2064), Hain 1978, pp. xvi–xviii). The five chapters or parts are: (a) 16a1–17a37 (on the principles of the enunciations); (b) 17a38–19b19 (on simple enunciations); (c) 19b19–21a33 (on composed enunciations); (d) 21a34–23a26 (on modal propositions); (e) 23a27–24b9 (on multiple enunciations).

first five *lectiones*, he follows the division of Guillelmus Arnaldus' *Expositio* of the *De Interpretatione*:³³

Table 1. Division of *lectiones* 1–5

Schol., <i>Ars Vet.</i> , 238, 1–273, 4	Arn., <i>Exp. Art. Vet.</i> , <i>lectiones</i> 1–5
238, 1–246, 10, Lect. 1	f. 47v col. a–48v, col. b, Lect. 1
246, 11–250, 26, Lect. 2	f. 48v, col. b–50r, col. a, Lect. 2
250, 27–255, 39, Lect. 3	f. 50r, col. a–51r, col. b, Lect. 3
256, 1–262, 28, Lect. 4	f. 51r, col. b–52r, col. b, Lect. 4
262, 29–273, 4, Lect. 5	f. 52r, col. b–53v, col. a, Lect. 5 ³⁴

Lectiones 6–10 follow Aquinas' *lectiones* I 10, I 11–II 2. Of the *lectiones* 7–10, one *lectio* comprises two *lectiones* from Aquinas as follows:³⁵

The Latin pattern of his division of *lectiones* 11–14 remains unknown.

Dividing the *De Interpretatione* and their commentaries into books, chapters or parts was very common among Aristotle's commentators, both Greek and Latin. Western scholars preferred Boethius' division into two books; this might go back to Alexander of Aphrodisias.³⁶ Greek commentators such as Ammonius,³⁷ Stephanus of Alexan-

³³ This commentary is found in an edition dated in 1507 under the name of Aegidius Romanus (*Expositio domini Egidij Romani in Artem ueterem videlicet in vniuersalibus: Predicamentis: Postpredicamentis: Sex principiis & Periermenias*, Rome 1507). Gauthier 1989, 69*–72 and Tabarroni 1988, 374–381, have shown that the author of the commentary is not Aegidius Romanus but Guillelmus Arnaldus.

³⁴ The *lectiones* in Ps.-Aegidius' edition of 1507 are marked with ornate initials.

³⁵ Cf. J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010c, 88–89, n. 75.

³⁶ Kesisoglou and Papatsimpas 2012, 29. First book: 16a1–19b5; second book: 19b5–24b9.

³⁷ Ammonius (*In "De Int."*, 7, 15–8, 23, Busse) divides Aristotle's *De Interpretatione* to four chapters (*κερպάλων*): (a) 8, 29–86, 10; (b) 86, 11–159, 9; (c) 159, 10–213, 34; and (d) 214, 1–251, 9, rejecting the authenticity of the last part of the *De Interpretatione* (23a27–24b9 Minio-Paluello). So, at the beginning of his commentary on this part (Amm., *In "De Int."* 251, 10–272, 32 Busse) he notes that, although he believes that this part was not written by Aristotle but by someone else after him, who wrote it either for exercise reasons or to discredit Aristotle, he nevertheless comments on it (Amm. *De Inter.* 251, 25–252, 27 Busse).

dria,³⁸ the anonymous commentator in Par. gr. 2064,³⁹ Michael Psellus,⁴⁰ Leo Magentius⁴¹ and Scholarius himself, divide the work into five chapters or parts⁴² (Ammonius calls these parts “chapters”, *κεφάλαια*, whereas all subsequent commentators call them “sections” or “parts”, *τμήματα*.) Scholarius’ division is as follows:

- 1) Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 238, 1–273, 4: lectiones 1–5
- 2) Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 273, 5–303, 28: lectiones 6–9
- 3) Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 303, 29–321, 22: lectiones 10–11
- 4) Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 321, 23–337, 13: lectiones 12–13

38 Stephanus (*In “De Int.”*, ed. M. Hayduck, *Stephani in librum Aristotelis De Interpretatione commentarium* (CAG 18), Berolini 1885, pp. 1–68, 15) also keeps the division to five parts, but he divides them to acts (πράξεις), too: a) <Αρχὴ τοῦ α τμῆματος>: 1, 4–24, 6 [Πρᾶξις α: 1, 4–6, 32 (*De Int.* 16a1–18), Πρᾶξις β. Περὶ ὄντος 6, 33–10, 18 (16a19–32), Πρᾶξις σὺν θεῷ γ: 10, 19–12, 23 (16a33–b5), Πρᾶξις σὺν θεῷ δ. Περὶ ρήματος, 12, 24–15, 4 (16b6–25), <Πρᾶξις ε>]. Περὶ λόγου, 15, 5–19, 30 (16b26–17a14), Πρᾶξις σὺν θεῷ ζ: 19, 31–21, 38 (17a15–25), Πρᾶξις σὺν θεῷ η: 22, 1–24, 6 (17a26–37)] b) Αρχὴ σὺν θεῷ τοῦ β τμῆματος: 24, 7–39, 20 [<Πρᾶξις α>: 24, 6–29, 8 (17a38–b11), <Πρᾶξις β: 29, 9–32, 18 (17b12–37), <Πρᾶξις γ>: 32, 19–34, 4 (17b38–18a27), <Πρᾶξις δ>: 34, 5–37, 29 (18a28–19a22), <Πρᾶξις ε>: 37, 30–3, 20 (19a23–b19)], c) Αρχὴ τοῦ γ τμῆματος: 39, 21–52, 34 [<Πρᾶξις α>: 39, 21–45, 11 (19b19–20a2), <Πρᾶξις β>: 45, 12–50, 27 (20a3–21a5), <Πρᾶξις γ>: 50, 28–52, 34 (21a6–33)], d) Αρχὴ τοῦ δ τμῆματος: 53, 1–63, 3 [<Πρᾶξις α>: 53, 1–55, 22 (21a34–35), <Πρᾶξις β>: 55, 23–58, 14 (21a34–37), <Πρᾶξις γ>: 58, 15–60, 20 (22a38–b28), <Πρᾶξις δ>: 60, 21–63, 3 (22b29–23a26)], e) Αρχὴ τοῦ ε τμῆματος: 63, 4–66, 3 [<Πρᾶξις α>: 63, 5–66, 3 (23a27–b31), <Πρᾶξις β>: 66, 4–68, 15 (23b32–24b9)].

39 Anonymous, *In “De Int.”*, Tarán 1978, divides his commentary as follows: a) 1, 3–30, 5; b) 30, 6–68, 16: Τμῆμα β’ περὶ τῶν ἐξ ὑποκειμένου καὶ κατηγορουμένου, c) 69, 1–100, 16: Αρχὴ τοῦ γ’ τμῆματος <Περὶ τῶν ἐκ γ’ προσκατηγορουμένου>, d) 101, 1–115, 6: Αρχὴ τοῦ δ’ τμῆματος, e) 115, 7–120, 14: Αρχὴ τοῦ ε’ τμῆματος.

40 Psellus’ division in his edited paraphrasis runs as follows (ed. A. Manutius, *Ammonii Hermeneiae commentaria in librum “Peri Hermeneias”*. *Magentini metropolitae Mytelinensis in eundem enarratio. Michaelis Pselli Paraphrasis in librum “Peri Hermeneias”*. *Ammonius Hermeneiae in “Decem categoriis”*, Venice 1503): (a) Αρχὴ τοῦ πρώτου τμῆματος: Mi v. 1– Mv v. 48; (b) Αρχὴ τοῦ δευτέρου τμῆματος: Mv v. 49–Ni r. 32; (c) Αρχὴ τοῦ τρίτου τμῆματος: Ni r. 33–Oι v. 7; (iv) Αρχὴ τοῦ τετάρτου τμῆματος: Oι v. 8–Oιv r. 20; (v) Αρχὴ τοῦ πέμπτου τμῆματος: Oιv r.21–Oιv r. 41; see Ierodiakonou 2002a, 162.

41 There is still no edition of Leo Magentinus’ commentary. I rely on cod. Vat. gr. 244 (s. XIII). (After f. 129v, the numbering continues with 120r, not 130r; the second ten of 120 is noted as f. 120r or v; (b), f. 121r or v (b) and so on.) Magentinus divides his commentary as follows: (a) f. 93r–106v: Αριστοτέλους Περὶ Ἐρμηνείας τμῆμα πρῶτον; (b) f. 106v–117v: Αρχὴ τοῦ δευτέρου τμῆματος. Περὶ τῶν ἐξ ὑποκειμένου καὶ κατηγορουμένου προτάσεων ἡ ἀποφάνσεων; (c) f. 117v–128v: Τμῆμα τρίτου; (d) f. 128v–127r: Αρχὴ τοῦ τετάρτου τμῆματος. Περὶ τῶν μετὰ τρόπου προτάσεων; (e) f. 127v (b)–137r: Περὶ Ἐρμηνείας τμῆμα ε.

42 There are nine surviving Greek commentaries on the *De Interpretatione* (by Ammonius, Stephanus of Alexandria, the anonymous commentator in Parisinus gr. 2064, Michael Psellus, Leo Magentinus, Scholarius, Olympiodorus, the anonymous author of cod. Coisl. 160, ff. 1r–96r, and Plut. 72.1, ff. 123r–149r, and John Italos). Olympiodorus (preserved in Urb. gr. 35 and edited by Tarán 1978) and John Italos (preserved in Par.gr. 1843 and edited by Brandis 1836) survived only in fragments; therefore, it is not possible to examine their style and content in full. The proem of the commentary on the *De Interpretatione* of the anonymous author of Coisl. 160 and Plut. 72.1 (partly edited by Bandis 1836, pp. 93–94) also divided the *De Interpretatione* to five chapters.

5) Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 337, 14–348, 40: lectio 14.

The sources of *lectio 1* were mainly Latin;⁴³ nevertheless, the proem of his commentary on the *De Interpretatione* follows the Greek pattern:⁴⁴

Table 2. Division of *lectiones* 6–10

Schol., <i>Ars Vet.</i> , 273, 5–308, 22, plus 308, 23–311	Aquinas, <i>In "De Int."</i> , <i>lectiones</i> 6–10
273, 5–280, 20, Lect. 6	Lect. I 10
280, 21–287, 39, Lect. 7	Lect. I 11–12
288, 1–296, 3, Lect. 8	Lect. I 13–14
296, 4–303, 28, Lect. 9	Lect. I 15–II 1
303, 29–308, 22, plus 308, 23–311, 26, Lect. 10	Lect. II 2 plus a part from one yet unidentified <i>continuatio</i> ⁴⁵

- 1) the subject-matter of the work (Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 238, 6–10: Ἡ μὲν ὑλικὴ αἰτία τούτου τοῦ βιβλίου [...])
- 2) its usefulness (Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 239, 9–13: Ἡ δὲ τελικὴ [αἰτία] [...])
- 3) how the *De Interpretatione* relates to the other Aristotelian works on logic (Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 238, 10–20: [...] τάττεται διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ πάρον βιβλίον πρὸς τὰ βιβλία ἐκεῖνα)
- 4) the title (Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 239, 14–22: Ἐπιγράφεται δὲ τὸ βιβλίον [...])
- 5) who the author is (Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 239, 8: Ἡ δὲ ποιητικὴ αἰτία [...])
- 6) division into chapters (Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 239, 5–6: [...] ἡ εἰς τὰ κεφάλαια καὶ τὰ μέρη διαίρεσις [...])
- 7) *forma tractandi* (Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 238, 22–239, 5, 239, 26–241, 25: [...] τὸ εἶδος τῆς μεταχειρίσεως [...])
- 8) which part of philosophy this writing falls under (Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 239, 23–25: Τίνι δὲ μέρει τῆς φιλοσοφίας ὑπόκειται [...]).

⁴³ Cf. sections 4.2.1–3 below.

⁴⁴ Scholarius mainly discusses the topics given by the anonymous author of the commentary found in cod. Coisl. gr. 160 and Plut. 72.1 (Brandis 1836, p. 93). Their only difference is that the anonymous author has one topic more: the “χαρακτήρ”, meaning the style of the book. Ammonius in his proem (Amm., *In "De Int."*, 1, 17–20), says that he will discuss five topics in his introduction: Ἀρχὴ τοίνυν ἡμῖν γενέσθω τῆς ἔξηγήσεως ἡ τῶν πέντε κεφαλαίων ὑφίγησις τῶν προλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς τοῦ ῥητοῦ σαφηνείας εἰώθότων. Likewise, the anonymous author in Coisl. 160 and Plut. 72.1 (Brandis 1836, p. 93) starts by stating that in his proem he will discuss the “εἰώθότα”, indicating that those topics were common in the previous Greek commentaries. Ammonius’ five chapters discuss: i) the subject under discussion of the work; ii) how this work connects with the other two Aristotelian books in logic; iii) information on the title; iv) who the author is and v) the proper division into chapters.

⁴⁵ Gauthier 1989, 5–56.

Scholarius declares his work to be his own creation, regardless of it being a compilation of the thoughts of others. At the head of each Part he writes: “Scholarius’ Έξήγησις”. Likewise, at the end of each Part, he notes: “This is the end of Scholarius’ Έξήγησις...”. Although he mentions that he uses some Latin sources, he does not name them⁴⁶. His reference to Aquinas regards only his own translation of Aquinas’ commentary on the *Analytica posteriora*.⁴⁷ This reference is reticent on Aquinas’ commentary on the *De Interpretatione*, which Scholarius silently but meticulously exploited.

A difference between Scholarius’ *Προλεγόμενα* in Porphyry’s *Isagoge* and commentary on the *Categories* and on the *De Interpretatione* is that, although all three texts are mainly translations from Latin authors, it is only in the first that he occasionally names some of his sources. In the marginal notes of cod. Vat. gr. (f. 5r) and Par. gr. (f. 9r), he mentions that the passage which follows (also written in the margins) derives from Aquinas. He also refers to Aquinas in *Ars Vet.*, 18, 29. As for Brito, he mentions him only twice: once by his name and once as τις λεπτὸς διδάσκαλος.⁴⁸ In his exposition of the *Categories* and the *De Interpretatione*, Scholarius does not seem to feel obliged to mention the names of his other sources or note who says what, because, as he had explained in his dedicatory letter, his aim was simply the dissemination of the excellent exegetical work of the Latins.

3 Translation issues

3.1 Style: Greek and Latin

It seems that Scholarius’ main Latin sources are five: for Porphyry’s *Isagoge* and the *Categories*: Thomas Aquinas and Radulphus Brito, and for the *De Interpretatione*: Thomas Aquinas, Radulphus Brito, Guillelmus Arnaldus, the anonymous author of the *Commentary on De Interpretatione* in Padova Bibl. Univ. 1589,⁴⁹ and at least one unidentified *continuatio* to Aquinas’ commentary on the *De Interpretatione*.

A simple reading of Scholarius’ text makes it obvious that it is not an original Greek text, but a translation from Latin. It is clear that he did not rephrase the achievements of the Latin authors he studied; he simply translated their work. As Ebbesen and Pinborg⁵⁰ have pointed out concerning the *Prolegomena* to Logic, Scholarius translates from Brito’s *Ars vetus* word for word, preserving the Latin syntax, and thereby

46 Cf. *supra*, p. 96, n. 20.

47 Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 4, 33–5, 2 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

48 Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 80, 1, and 60, 6. Cf. Ebbesen and Pinborg 1981–1982, 263–266.

49 Gauthier 1989, 65–66 has argued that this author is the 13th century professor of logic John Pagus, but Hansen 2012, 25–29 has disproved this.

50 Ebbesen and Pinborg 1981–1982, 263–273.

often making the text difficult for Greeks to understand. In addition, he often seems to be unfamiliar with certain Latin and Greek philosophical terms, facing difficulties in rendering Latin expressions into comprehensible Greek.⁵¹

3.2 Omissions

There are a few omissions in Scholarius' translations. In three cases of his exposition of the *De Interpretatione*⁵² he leaves a blank space for the number of the book of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*,⁵³ presumably in order to fill in it later. Those blank spaces are found in all the manuscripts. In his translation of Aquinas' commentary on the *De anima* and the *De ente et essentia*, Scholarius leaves blank spaces not only for the book numbers of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, *Physics* and *Ethics*⁵⁴ but also for Latin words, which he either could not read or did not know how to render into Greek. Those spaces also have never been filled, except for a single case, namely in his translation of Aquinas' commentary on *De anima* – he filled in it when he was copying his older manuscript.⁵⁵

A possible explanation for these omissions is that Latin scholars referred to translations from Greek and Arabic texts, whose numbering of the books of Aristotle's writings was in some cases different from that in the Greek tradition, thus rendering the identification of the passages a hard task for a Greek scholar; e. g., Aquinas used to refer to Albert the Great's or to his own commentaries on Aristotle's works rather than to the original text of Aristotle, depending on what was available to him at the time of producing this or that writing of his.⁵⁶

51 Ebbesen and Pinborg 1981–1982, 270–273.

52 Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 273, 28; 275, 3; 302, 20.

53 There is also a similar omission in Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 168, 26 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

54 For *Metaphysics*: Schol., *In DEE*, 190, 28 and 205, 2 (ed. L. Petit, X.-A. Sideridès, M. Jugie, *Γενναδίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἄπαντα τὰ εύρισκόμενα. Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. VI, Paris 1933); Schol., translation of Aquinas' commentary on the *De an.*, 400, 26, 487, 1, 545, 21, 567, 26 (ed. L. Petit, X.-A. Sideridès, M. Jugie, *Γενναδίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἄπαντα τὰ εύρισκόμενα. Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. VI, Paris 1933), Schol., *Contra Plethonem*, 29, 6 and 106, 9 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie). For *Physics*: Schol., *In DEE*, 206, 17 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie, Schol., *De an.*, 354, 13 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie (in this case, although there is a blank space in cod. Plut. 86.19, Pal. gr. 235, which is a copy of Plut., fills in the blank space). For the *Nicomachean Ethics*: Schol., *In DEE*, 184, 2 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

55 Schol., *De an.*, 452, 20 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie: Aqu., *De an.*, II 14, 399, ed. Pirota, *In Aristotelis libros De Anima commentarium*, Turin 1948, 472, 23 (*et putredines queruum*) : II 18, 470 (*pulpi*), 491, 4: II 23, 538 (*ex impressione*), 563, 5: III 14, 804 (*perficitur*), 563, 14: III 14, 805 (*arduum*).

56 Cf. R.-A. Gauthier, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin. Somme contre les Gentils. Introduction*, Paris 1993, 77–92. On the reflection of this problem on Scholarius' Greek rendering of Aquinas' writings, see J. A. Demetracopoulos 2017c.

4 Scholarius' sources

4.1 Greek sources

Very few – yet interesting – things in the *Commentary on the De Interpretatione* are Scholarius' own additions. These *loci* are easily discernible, as they are distinctively Greek in syntax and vocabulary. Sometimes Scholarius notes in the margins that a passage from his handbook is a personal comment of his.⁵⁷ The interesting thing regarding his Greek sources is that, when quoting from Greek scholars, he uses their names, usually doing so in order to oppose them.

4.1.1 Psellus

Cod. Barb. gr. 164 is a 13th century manuscript which contains: i) parts of Psellus' paraphrasis of the *De Interpretatione*; ii) parts of the *De Interpretatione* with Psellus' and Scholarius' *scholia*; iii) the *Analytica priora* with Leo Magentinus *scholia*; iv) the *Analytica posteriora* with *scholia*; v) the *Topica* with *scholia* from Scholarius and Leo Magentinus; vi) the *Sophistical Refutations* and vii) a fragment of Porphyry's *scholia* in the *Categories*.⁵⁸

In the folia containing the *De Interpretatione*, there are several interlinear and marginal *scholia* added by Scholarius himself, probably written at different times. Scholarius' handwriting in this manuscript seems to be quite close to his handwriting in Vat. gr. 2223, which is probably the earliest of the extant versions of Scholarius' *Ars vetus*;⁵⁹ this suggests that they are both part of Scholarius' early engagement with philosophy.

There are two cases where Scholarius mentions Psellus.⁶⁰ In the first case, he uses Psellus' explanation as to how “the many” can sometimes be “one”. In the second

⁵⁷ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 266, 3–10 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie: ”Ιστέον ὅτι ταῦτα, ὡς ὁ Ψελλός φησιν, οὕτω τέθειται. Βούλεται δὲ λέγειν ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐκεῖνος τὸ μὲν κυρίως εἶναι ἐν ὧς οὐδενὶ τρόπῳ μετέχον συνθέσεως, τὸ δὲ τῇ συνθέσει ἔν, ἢ τῇ συνθέσει τοῦ πράγματος, ἢ τῇ συνθέσει τῶν λόγων. Πεπονθός μὲν οὖν τὴν ἐνότητα καλεῖ τὸ ἐκ πραγμάτων συντεθειμένον, οἷον τὸ σῶμα ἐκ τῶν στοιχείων, ἢ τὸν Σωκράτην ἐκ τοῦ ζώου καὶ τοῦ λευκοῦ καὶ τοῦ τριπτήκος· ἔχον δὲ τὴν ἐνότητα λέγει τὸ ἐκ τῶν λόγων συντεθειμένον, ἥγουν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ τοῦ λογικοῦ ζώου καὶ τοῦ θνητοῦ· ταῦτα γὰρ λόγοι τινές εἰσιν ἐν πρᾶγμα σημαντοντες [...]”. This passage is an addition written in the margin in cod. Vat. gr. Par. gr. and Mut., whereas in cod. Bar. gr. it joins part of the main text, with a note in the margin of f.181r: “Τούτο σχόλιον ἔστιν, ἔως τοῦ ‘καὶ ὅτι τὰ σύμπαντα’”. Then, Scholarius quotes a passage from Psell., *In “De Int.”*, Miv v, 42–48 Manutius. In this case, he names his source and distinguishes his comment from the text of his source.

⁵⁸ For a description of the manuscript see Mogenet 1989, vol. 2, 1–2.

⁵⁹ See *supra*, p. 94.

⁶⁰ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 266, 3–19, 338, 8–11 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

case, Psellus is mentioned as one of the scholars that challenge the authenticity of 23a27–23b4. In this case, Scholarius argues that Psellus, Ammonius, and some other commentators, are wrong in arguing so.⁶¹

4.1.2 Ammonius

Scholarius comments on Ammonius' point that the passage 23a 27–b 2 of *De Interpretatione* is not genuine. First, he reproduces the content of Ammonius' passage⁶² on the issue; then he refutes this argument.⁶³ Concerning Ammonius' argument that Porphyry should be included among those who challenged the authenticity of the passage, because he does not comment on it, Scholarius replies that: (a) this passage is so clear that there is no need for explanation, and (b) Porphyry never states that, to him, this passage does not seem genuine.⁶⁴ So, Scholarius justifies himself before going on to analyze this passage.

4.2 Latin sources

4.2.1 Thomas Aquinas and Radulphus Brito

As Ebbesen and Pinborg have shown,⁶⁵ Scholarius made extensive use of Radulphus Brito's *Quaestiones super Artem Veterem* and the prooemium of his *Quaestiones super "Sophisticos Elenchos"*, with few extracts from Aquinas' *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Commentary on the Analytica posteriora*; Scholarius however, does not mention it. The derivative character of his work is obvious in the Prolegomena and less obvious in the *Categories*. Less often, he abbreviates the *quaestiones* of his Latin sources. Regarding the *De Interpretatione*, Demetracopoulos⁶⁶ has shown that Scholarius' text is, for the most part, a translation of Aquinas' commentary. A few parts were translated word for word, others were paraphrased, and several were abridged. Syntax and terminology betray the Latin provenance of the text.⁶⁷ The same holds for the *Continuatio* to Aquinas' unfinished *Commentary*; a small part of the *Continuatio* belongs to

⁶¹ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 338, 6–10 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

⁶² Amm., *In "De Int."* 251, 10–253, 2 Busse

⁶³ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 338, 25–339, 6 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

⁶⁴ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 338, 29–33 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

⁶⁵ Ebbesen and Pinborg 1981–1982, 267–269.

⁶⁶ J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010c, 88, n. 75. To Demetracopoulos' list of findings, one can add the following three passages: *Ars Vet.*, 239, 31–34 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie = Aquinas' *De Int.*, I 1, 4; 244, 29–34 = I 2, 5; 245, 1–13 = I 2, 6.

⁶⁷ Cf. Section 3.1 above.

Radulphus Brito,⁶⁸ whereas the remaining parts belong to some so far unidentified Latin author/-s.

This is also how Scholarius was to elaborate “his” *Commentary* on Aquinas’ *De ente et essentia*. As has been shown by Barbour,⁶⁹ this *Commentary* is a translation of Armandus de Bellovisu’s *Commentary*. Scholarius conceals this and dedicates the text to his disciple, Matthew Camariotes, as his own work.⁷⁰

4.2.2 Anonymous’ commentary in cod. Padova, Biblioteca Universitaria 1589 and cod. Palermo, Bibl. Com. 2Qq. D 142

Another Latin source of Scholarius seems to be in a text preserved in cod. Padova, Biblioteca Universitaria 1589. This is a 14th century manuscript that contains a commentary on the *Isagoge*, John Pagus’ commentary on the *Categories*, a commentary on the *De Interpretatione*, and a commentary on *De sex principiis*.⁷¹

Part of the text of that commentary on *De Interpretatione* is also found in cod. Palermo, Bibl. Com. 2Qq. D 142.⁷² According to Gauthier, this commentary on *De Interpretatione* belongs to John Pagus, like the commentary on the *Categories* found in the same manuscript. For Gauthier, two things show Pagus’ authorship. First, the colophon in f. 172v reads: “*Explicit scriptum super totam Artem veterem secundum magistrum Iohannem Pagum. Deo gratias. Amen*”. Further, there are certain literal parallels between the text of the Padova Commentary on *Categories* and the text of the Commentary on the *De Interpretatione* in the same manuscript (for instance, the application of the four causes to the *De Interpretatione*).⁷³ Hansen,⁷⁴ comparing in detail Pagus’ Commentary on *Categories* to the three other commentaries in the Padova manuscript, challenged the claim that the colophon ascribes the full logical course to Pagus. This, together with a detailed comparison of the content and the style of the Commentaries, discredits Gauthier’s ascription of the Commentary on *Categories* to Pagus.

⁶⁸ As Ebbesen and Pinborg 1981–1982, 269 have shown, Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 347, 7–348, 29 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie coincides with Brito’s *quaestio 24*.

⁶⁹ Barbour 1993c, 74–85.

⁷⁰ Schol., *In DEE*, 178, 10–326, 37 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

⁷¹ For the description of the manuscript see Hansen 2012, 22–29.

⁷² Hansen 2012, 27–28.

⁷³ Gauthier 1989, 65*–66*.

⁷⁴ Hansen 2012, 25–29 and 145–158.

Regardless, what has not been noticed so far is that the Commentary of Pagus or not-Pagus exhibits certain very close similarities to Scholarius' proem (Lectio 1) to his *De Interpretatione* commentary:

Pad. Bibl. Univ. 1589, f.69r, col. a:	Schol., Ars Vet., 238, 6–239, 13:
<p>Causa uero formalis huius libri est duplex, sicut duplex est forma, scilicet tractandi <et> tractatus. Forma tractandi idem est quod modus agendi, qui est quintuplex, scilicet diffinitius, divisius, probatius, improbatius et exemplorum positius [...] Forma uero tractatus est diuisio libri in capitula et in partes, secundum quod est in lectionibus singulis manifestum [...] Causa uero finalis est triplex, quoniam triplex est finis, scilicet propinquus, remotus et remotissimus: propinquus est ut perlecto libro habeamus cognitionem eorum que determinantur in hoc libro; remotus est ut per consequens habeamus cognitionem totius logice; finis uero remotissimus est perfectio anime rationalis [...]⁷⁵</p>	<p>Εἰδικὴ δὲ αἵτια ἔστι τὸ εἶδος τῆς πραγματείας καὶ τὸ εἶδος τῆς μεταχειρίσεως. Τὸ εἶδος τῆς μεταχειρίσεως ἔστι ὁ ποιητικὸς τρόπος, ὃς ἔστι πενταχῶς· ὄριστικός, ἀποδεικτικός, ἐλεγκτικός, διαιρετικός καὶ παραδειγμάτων ἐκθετικός [...] Τὸ δὲ εἶδος τῆς πραγματείας ἔστιν ἡ εἰς τὰ κεφάλαια καὶ τὰ μέρη διαιρεσις, ὡς ἐφ' ἑκάστου δῆλον γενήσεται [...] Η δὲ τελικὴ ἔστι τριπλῆ· ἡ προσεχής, ἡ πόρρω καὶ ἡ ἀπωτάτω, ἥγουν ἡ γνῶσις τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ βιβλίῳ περιεχομένων, ἡ γνῶσις ὅλης τῆς λογικῆς καὶ ἡ τελείωσις τῆς λογικῆς ψυχῆς ἐν τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ [...]</p>

Doubtlessly, a more thorough search would turn up further common elements.

4.2.3 Guillelmus Arnaldus (Pseudo-Aegidius Romanus)

Another recognizable Latin source, which has so far passed unnoticed, too, seems to be a text by Guillelmus Arnaldus (13th century).⁷⁶ The 1507 edition of Aegidius' *Expositio in Artem veterem* consists of commentaries on the *Isagoge*, the *Categories* (including the *Postpraedicamenta*), the *De sex principiis* and the *De Interpretatione*. The commentary on the *De Interpretatione* is on f. 47v, col. a–69v, col. b. Scholarius trans-

⁷⁵ Cf. Gauthier 1989, 66*.

⁷⁶ See note 33 on p. 99 above.

lates some passages from Arnaldus' commentary. Although this is not a word for word translation, the similarities are obvious. For example:

Arn., <i>Exp. Art. Vet.</i> , f. 48v, col. b:	Schol., <i>Ars Vet.</i> , 246, 14–32
[...] Primo determinat de principijs materialibus ipsius enunciationis. Secundo de principio formali. Secunda ibi [Oratio]. Prima in duas. Primo determinat de nomine. Secundo de verbo. Secunda ibi [Verbum]. Prima in duas. Primo diffinit nomen et declarat diffinitionem. Secundo remouet quedam a natura nominis. Secunda ibi [Non homo]. Prima in duas. Primo diffinit. Secundo declarat. Secunda ibi [In nomine]. Hec secunda in duas. Primo declarat hanc partem [cuius nulla pars]. Secundo hanc partem [ad placitum]. Secunda ibi [vero placitum]. Prima in duas. Nam primo declarat quae partes nominis non significant separate. Secundo comparat partes nominis compositi ad partes nominis simplicis. Secunda ibi [At vero quemadmodum]. Illa pars [nono homo] habet duas. Primo remouet nomen infinitum. Secundo nomen obliquum. Secunda ibi [Catonis] [...]	[...] Εν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει ἐπεξεργάζεται περὶ αὐτῶν τῶν μερῶν ἢ ἀρχῶν τῆς ἀποφάνσεως ἥγουν περὶ τῶν δύο ὑλικῶν ἀρχῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ὄνόματος καὶ τοῦ ὄριματος· εἴτα περὶ τῶν εἰδικῶν. Άλλὰ νῦν πρῶτον λέγει περὶ τῆς ὑλικῆς ἀρχῆς, ἣτις ἔστι τὸ ὄνομα. Περὶ τούτο δὲ δύο ποιεῖ. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὄριζεται τὸ ὄνομα· δεύτερον, ἀποσκευάζεται τίνα ἐκ τοῦ ὄρισμοῦ τοῦ ὄνόματος, ἀπερ οὐκ εἰσὶν ὄνόματα, ἐν τῷ· «Τὸ δὲ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος». Τὸ πρῶτον πάλιν διαιρεῖται εἰς δύο. Πρῶτον, ὄριζεται τὸ ὄνομα· δεύτερον ἔξηγεται τὸν ὄρισμόν, ὅποταν λέγῃ· «Ἐν γὰρ τῷ Κάλλιππος». Καὶ δεύτερον πάλιν διαιρεῖται εἰς δύο· πρῶτον γὰρ ἔξηγεται ἐν μέρος τοῦ ὄρισμοῦ· δεύτερον ἔξηγεται ἔτερον μέρος. Τὸ πρῶτον διαιρεῖται εἰς δύο. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἔξηγεται τὸ μέρος ἐκεῖνο τοῦ ὄρισμοῦ· δεύτερον, ἐμπίπτει εἰς τὸ παραβαλεῖν τὰ μέρη τοῦ ἀπλοῦ ὄνόματος πρὸς τὰ μέρη τοῦ συνθέτου ὄνόματος. τότε ἀκολουθεῖ ἐκεῖνο τὸ μέρος, ἐν ᾧ ἀφίστησι τίνα ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρισμοῦ τοῦ ὄνόματος. Καὶ διαιρεῖται εἰς δύο. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἀφίστησι τὰ ἀόριστα ὄνόματα· δεύτερον, τὰ πλάγια, ἀ καλεῖ πτώσεις ὄνόματος.

One can also compare the following:

Table 3

Schol., <i>Ars Vet.</i>	Arn. <i>Exp. Art. Vet.</i>
241, 30–242, 4	f. 48r, col. b–48v, col. a
243, 22–29	f. 48r, col. b
246, 14–32	f. 48v, col. b

Further, as mentioned above,⁷⁷ Scholarius follows Arnaldus' division into *lectiones* in his first five *lectiones*. Moreover, in *Lectio I*, he follows the division of Arnaldus' chapters by analyzing the subject in the same order as Arnaldus:

1. Ὄνομα μὲν οὖν ἔστι > Nomen ergo est vox significativa secundum placitum [...]
2. Ἐν γὰρ τῷ Κάλλιππος > In nomine enim quod est equiferus [...]
3. Οὐ μὴν οὐδέ' ὥσπερ > At vero non quemadmodum in simplicibus nominibus [...]
4. Τὸ δὲ κατὰ συνθήκην > Secundum vero placitum [...]
5. Τὸ δὲ οὐκ > Non homo vero non est nomen [...]
6. Τὸ δὲ Φίλωνος > Catonis autem vel Catoni [...]

Scholarius omits the last chapter of Arnaldus concerning *λόγος*, a subject discussed later on in his handbook.

4.2.4 How Scholarius exploited his sources

Aegidius' presence in Scholarius' text is not as obvious as that of Aquinas. Radulphus Brito is used twice, while the Anonymus of the Padova manuscript only once. Aquinas is Scholarius' main source.

Let us examine more closely how Scholarius' Latin sources were put together. In the beginning of the text, Aquinas is sparsely used. The introduction is a farrago of Scholarius' readings, often by means of a word for word translation or summarized passages. For instance, Scholarius applies Aristotle's set of four *causes* (*materialis*, *formalis*, *efficiens*, and *finalis*) to the *De Interpretatione*;⁷⁸ this application does not occur in Aquinas or Radulphus Brito, but in Anonymous' Commentary on *De Interpretatione* in the Padova and the Palermo manuscripts.⁷⁹ Sometimes, he takes phrases from different Latin sources and puts them together as his "own". Some of these phrases are from Arnaldus' examples,⁸⁰ and some from Aquinas'.⁸¹ He also explains certain definitions (e. g., the definition of name and, partly, of verb and speech⁸²) differently from Aquinas but, at least in the discussion of name, similarly to Arnaldus.⁸³ Further-

⁷⁷ See *supra* p. 99.

⁷⁸ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 238, 6–239, 13 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

⁷⁹ Cf. Section 4.2.2 above.

⁸⁰ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 238, 10–20 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie = Aeg., *Exp. Art. Vet.*, f. 47v col. a; Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 243, 20–29 = Aeg., *Exp. Art. Vet.*, f. 48r, col. b. More can be added.

⁸¹ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 242, 14–24, 27–35 Jugie/Petit/Sideridès = Aquinas, *In "De Int."*, I 1, 1, I 1, 2 Gauthier; Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 244, 29–34 = Aquinas, *In "De Int."*, I 2, 5. More can be added.

⁸² In this case, his definitions are compiled from Aquinas' definitions and some other, yet unidentified author/-s.

⁸³ Aeg., *Exp. Art. Vet.*, f. 48v col. b.

more, Scholarius' account for the title of the *De Interpretatione*⁸⁴ differs from his so far known sources.

Scholarius reproduces Aquinas' *Commentary* from Lectio 4, par. 12 in a slavish manner (starting from the second half of his first *lectio*), except for some replies of Aquinas to some earlier commentators, such as Alexander and Ammonius. He omits Aquinas' proem and discussion of the reasons why Aristotle did not explicitly divide the “enunciation” into “categorical” and “hypothetical”⁸⁵. He also skips over Aquinas’ view on the order of Aristotle’s analysis of “enunciation”⁸⁶.

In a single case, Scholarius refers to Aquinas’ *Summa Theologiae*.⁸⁷ He takes this reference from Radulphus Brito’s commentary on the *De Interpretatione*,⁸⁸ but changes it in a practical way: although Brito refers to Aquinas’ *Expositio Peri Hermeneias* (Lectio 14), Scholarius refers his Greek reader to the *Summa Theologiae*, Ia Pars, qu. 14, art. 13, where the same topic, namely the infallibility of the divine knowledge, including foreknowledge, is discussed. He recommends it as “further reading” on the issue. Presumably, his intention was to refer to a text that would make sense to his Greek readership; the Ia Pars of the *Summa Theologiae* was available in the Greek translation by Demetrios Cydones already from 1358,⁸⁹ and Scholarius had obtained a copy from 1432.⁹⁰

Concerning the *Continuatio*,⁹¹ three out of the four known Latin *Continuations* that antedate Scholarius⁹² have been edited, yet none of them coincides with that of Scholarius.

Another interesting issue is the reception of Scholarius’ *Ars vetus*.⁹³ Scholarius himself used his *Commentary* on the *De Interpretatione* not only for teaching purposes but also in order to serve his quarrel with Plethon. For instance,⁹⁴ some arguments

⁸⁴ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 239, 14–22 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

⁸⁵ Aquinas, In “*De Int.*”, I 1, 8 Gauthier.

⁸⁶ Aquinas, In “*De Int.*”, lect. I 2–3 Gauthier (except from some small parts of Aquinas’ In “*De Int.*”, I 2, 5, I 2, 6 = Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 244, 29–34, 245, 1–13 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie).

⁸⁷ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 300, 28–31 Petit/Sideridès/Jugie.

⁸⁸ Cf. *Quaestiones subtilissime magistri Radulphi Britonis super arte veteri*, ed. Franciscus de Macerata, J. Rubeus, Al. Rubeus, Venice c. 1499, p. 167 col. b.

⁸⁹ See Papadopoulos 1967b, 43–52.

⁹⁰ See Demetracopoulos’s paper in this volume, p. 152.

⁹¹ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, 308, 23–348, 38.

⁹² Gratiadeus di Ascoli (14th century), found in Venice edition of 1481 (cf. Gauthier 1989, 7*; Lewry 1981, 59 gave 1495 as the date of the first edition of this *continuatio*), who is the earliest known scholar who wrote a *continuation* for Aquinas’ unfinished commentary; Robertus de Vulgarbia, Thomas Sutton (edited by Lewry 1981), and the anonymous of the fourteenth century manuscript Conv. sopro. J.X. 27 (Lewry 1981, 59), which is still unedited.

⁹³ Cf. Section 1.2 above.

⁹⁴ See J. A. Demetracopoulos 2012a, 123; J. A. Demetracopoulos n.d.(b).

from this Commentary⁹⁵ found their way to his refutation of what Plethon says against the Aristotelian principle of contradiction in his celebrated *De differentiis*. It is, however, as yet too early to form an overall picture of the impact of Scholarius' *Ars vetus* on the intellectual debates of the Byzantine 15th century.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abbreviations

<i>Ars Vet.</i>	<i>Ars Vetus</i>
CAG	<i>Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca</i> , Berlin 1882–1909, 33 vols.
DEE	<i>De Ente et Essentia</i>
<i>De an.</i>	<i>De Anima</i>
<i>De Int.</i>	<i>De Interpretatione</i>
<i>Exp. Art. Vet.</i>	<i>Expositio in Artem Veterem</i>

Primary Sources

Ammonius, *De Interpretatione*, ed. A. Busse, *Ammonius in Aristotelis De Interpretatione Commentarius* (CAG 4.5), Berlin 1897.

Anonymous, *De Interpretatione*, ed. L. Tarán, *Anonymous Commentary on Aristotle's De Interpretatione* (codex Parisinus Graecus 2064), Hain 1978.

Anonymous, *De Interpretatione*, Ch. Au. Brandis, *Scholia in Aristotelem*, in ed. Imm. Bekker, *Aristotelis opera*, vol. IV, Berolini 1836, pp. 93–94.

Aristotle, *De Interpretatione*, ed. L. Minio-Paluello, *Aristotelis Categoriae et liber De Interpretatione*, Oxonii 1956.

Guillelmus Arnaldus, *De Interpretatione. Expositio domini Egidij Romani in Artem ueterem videlicet in vniuersalibus: Predicamentis: Postpredicamentis: Sex principiis & Periermenias*, Rome 1507.

Psellus, *De Interpretatione*, ed. A. Manutius, *Ammonii Hermeiae commentaria in librum "Peri Hermeneias". Magentini metropolitae Mytelensis in eundem enarratio. Michaelis Pselli Paraphrasis in librum "Peri Hermeneias". Ammonius Hermeiae in "Decem categoriis"*, Venice 1503.

Radulphus Brito, *Quaestiones subtilissime magistri Radulphi Britonis super Arte veteri*, ed. Franciscus de Macerata, J. Rubeus, Al. Rubeus, Venice c. 1499.

Scholarius, *Ars Vetus*, ed. L. Petit, X.-A. Sideridès, M. Jugie, *Γενναδίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἄπαντα τὰ εύρισκόμενα. Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. VII, Paris 1936, 1–348.

Scholarius,

Thomae Aquinae De Anima, ed. L. Petit, X.-A. Sideridès, M. Jugie, *Γενναδίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἄπαντα τὰ εύρισκόμενα. Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. VI, Paris 1933, 327–581.

Scholarius, *De Ente et Essentia*, ed. L. Petit, X.-A. Sideridès, M. Jugie, *Γενναδίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἄπαντα τὰ εύρισκόμενα. Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. VI, Paris 1933, 154–326.

⁹⁵ Schol., *Ars Vet.*, VII 282.4–286.16.

Scholarius, *Contra Plethonem*, ed. L. Petit, X.-A. Sideridès, M. Jugie, *Γενναδίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἄπαντα τὰ εύρισκόμενα. Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. IV, Paris 1935, 1–116.

Stephanus, *De Interpretatione*, ed. M. Hayduck, *Stephani in Librum Aristotelis De Interpretatione commentarium* (CAG 18), Berolini 1885.

Thomas Aquinas, Commentary on *De Interpretatione*, ed. R.-A. Gauthier, *Expositio libri Peryermenias*, in *Sancti Thomae de Aquino opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P.M. edita*, vol. 1.1, Rome-Paris 1989.

Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary in De anima*, ed. A. Pirotta, *Thomas Aquinas. In Aristotelis librum de Anima commentarium*, Turin 1948.

Secondary Sources

Barbour, H. C. (1993c). *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios and His Translation of the Commentary of Armandus de Bellovisu on the “De ente ed essentia” of Thomas Aquinas*. *Studi Thomistici*, 53. Vatican City.

Canart, P. (1970). *Codices Vaticani graeci: Codices 1745–1962*. Vol. 1. Vatican City.

Cataldi Palau, A. (1995). “La biblioteca del cardinale Giovanni Salviati. Alcuni nuovi manoscritti greci in biblioteche diverse della Vaticana”. In: *Scriptorium* 49, pp. 60–95.

De Andrés, G. (1965). *Catálogo des los códices griegos de la Real Biblioteca de el Escorial*. Vol. 2. Madrid.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. “Georgios Scholarios – Gennadios II”. In: *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie: Die Philosophie des Mittelalters*. Band 1/1: *Jüdische und byzantinische Philosophie*. Bandteil 1: *Byzantinische Philosophie*. Ed. by G. Kaprev. Translated from English into German by S. Markov, forthcoming. Basel.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2010c). “Échos d’Orient – Résonances d’Ouest”. In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition. II: XIIIe–XIXe s.* Ed. by C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello. Nicolaus. Rivista di Teologia Ecumenico-patristica, 37/2, pp. 67–148.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2012a). “The Influence of Thomas Aquinas in Late Byzantine Philosophical and Theological Thought: À propos of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus Project*”. In: *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale* 54, pp. 101–124.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2012e). “Thomas Aquinas’ Impact on Late Byzantine Theology and Philosophy: The Issues of Method or *Modus Sciendi* and *Dignitas Hominis*”. In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissenformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 36. Berlin, pp. 333–410.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2014c). “Latin Philosophical Works Translated into Greek”. In: *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*. Ed. by R. Pasnau and C. van Dyke. 2nd ed. Cambridge, pp. 822–826.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2017c). “George Gennadios II – Scholarios’ Abridgment of the *Parva Naturalia*: Its Place in his Œuvre and in the History of Byzantine Aristotelianism”. In: *Cross-Cultural Dialogues: The Parva Naturalia in Greek, Arabic and Latin Aristotelianism. 2014 Conference Gothenburg*, 6–8 June. Ed. by B. Bydén and F. Radovic. Forthcoming. Dordrecht.

Ebbesen, S. and J. Pinborg (1981–1982). “Gennadios and Western Scholasticism. Radulphus Brito’s *Ars Vetus* in Greek Translation”. In: *Classica et Mediaevalia* 33, pp. 263–324.

Gauthier, R.-A. (1989). “*Expositio libri Peryermenias*”. In: *Sancti Thomae de Aquino. Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P.M. edita*. Vol. 1.1. Rome and Paris.

Gauthier, R.-A. (1993). *Saint Thomas d’Aquin. Somme contre les Gentils. Introduction*. Paris.

Hansen, H. (2012). *John Pagus on Aristotle’s “Categories”. A Study and Edition of the “Rationes super Praedicamenta Aristotelis”*. Leuven.

Ierodiakonou, K. (2002a). "Psellos' Paraphrasis on Aristotle's 'De Interpretatione'". In: *Byzantine philosophy and its Ancient Sources*. Ed. by K. Ierodiakonou. Oxford, pp. 157–181.

Ierodiakonou, K. (2011). "The Western Influence on late Byzantine Aristotelian Commentaries". In: *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*. Ed. by M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel. Leuven, pp. 373–383.

Kesisoglou, A. and G. Papatsimpas (2012). *Αριστοτέλης. Περί Ερμηνείας*. Athens.

Lewry, O. P. (1981). "Two Continuators of Aquinas: Robertus de Vulgarbia and Thomas Sutton on the *Perihermeneias* of Aristotle". In: *Medieval Studies* 43, pp. 58–130.

Lilla, S. (1985). *Codices Vaticani graeci: Codices 2162–2254 (Codices Culmannenses)*. Vatican City.

Mercati, G. (1920). "Appunti scolari". In: *Bessarione* 36, pp. 109–143.

Mogenet, J. (1989). *Codices Barberiniani Graeci*. Vol. 2. Vatican City.

Omont, H. (1888). *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Vol. 2. Paris.

Papadopoulos, S. G. (1967b). *Ἐλληνικὰ μεταφράσεις θωμιστικῶν ἔργων. Φιλοθωμιστὰ καὶ ἀντιθωμιστὰ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ*. Athens.

Puntoni, V. (1965). *Indice dei codici greci della Biblioteca Estense di Modena*, Bologna 1896. Vol. 1. Catalogi Codicum Graecorum qui in minoribus Bibliothecis italicis asservantur, 1. Lipsiae.

Tabarroni, A. (1988). "Lo Pseudo Egidio (Guglielmo Arnaldi) e un'inedita continuazione del commento di Tommaso al *Peryermenias*". In: *Medioevo* 14, pp. 370–427.

Tavardon, P. (1976). *Commentaire de la logique d'Aristote par Georges Scholarios: les ante-predicaments*. Toulouse.

Marie-Hélène Blanchet

The Two Byzantine Translations of Thomas Aquinas' *De Rationibus Fidei*

Remarks in view of their on-going *editio princeps*

Historians often use the term “estrangement” to describe the evolution of the relations between Eastern and Western Europe during the Middle Ages: they consider that ignorance gradually prevailed between the two parts of medieval Christendom, which, at a certain time, diverged and were unable to understand each other. Yet, what was true at the time of the schism in the 11th century was no longer valid in the 14th century, when interaction on several levels between Byzantium and the West had once again intensified. The analysis of the relations between the Byzantine-Slavic East and the West in the late Middle Ages must therefore be based on a different paradigm than that of misunderstanding and mutual hostility. The idea that the Byzantines despised and ignored the West must be substituted with another approach taking into account the continuous contacts between Constantinople and the Latins, especially those who had settled in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204 and those who were conducting business in the Byzantine capital.

Intellectual exchanges had never been as intense and fruitful between these two worlds as they were during the 14th and 15th centuries. Historians are well aware of how much Renaissance Italy owed to the arrival, in the 15th century, of Byzantine scholars with their collections of Greek manuscripts containing the original texts of Plato and Aristotle. Less well known, however, is the movement in the opposite direction, from Western to Eastern Europe, that preceded it in the 13th and 14th centuries. It allowed the introduction and spread of Western culture in Byzantium and created the conditions for a renewed dialogue.¹ From the late 13th century, the main means of this intellectual rapprochement consisted of translating Latin works into Greek, both tales of chivalry and philosophical or theological treatises.² From 1354 to the end of 1360s,

I would like to thank John Demetracopoulos, Raúl Estangüí Gómez, Jean-François Vannier and Nikos Melvani for their help while writing this article.

¹ There was indeed a dialogue between Byzantine and Western intellectuals before the Palaiologan era, especially during the 12th century, as recently emphasized by Cameron 2016, 68–95, but it remained basically oral, or in the best case it was based on *florilegia*. It did not allow a thorough understanding of the opposite arguments, as the most important texts of the Latin tradition were still unavailable in Byzantium and did not begin to be translated before the end of the 13th century.

² The best known translator during that period was Maximos Planoudes (ca. 1255–ca. 1305), who was the first since Late Antiquity to translate into Greek several Latin theological works, espe-

fifteen treatises of Thomas Aquinas, especially the two *Summae*, were thus made available to Greek scholars, mainly thanks to two translators, the brothers Demetrios Kydones (ca. 1324–1397) and Prochoros Kydones (ca. 1333–ca. 1370).³ In Constantinople, this magnum opus of Western scholastics became a subject of debate and was from then on the focus of most of the intellectual life in Byzantium for nearly a century.⁴ Even though this unprecedented cultural transfer from the West to the East met with resistance, expressed especially in the religious field, it still shows that a form of intellectual and religious acculturation of Latin thought in the Orthodox world was possible at that time.

The work of Thomas Aquinas was a privileged vehicle for the penetration of Latin thought among Byzantine scholars. His treatises were translated into Greek, read, commented upon and used both by the Byzantine advocates of the Latin doctrine and by their detractors. In the absence of a critical edition of these translations,⁵ it remains very difficult to detect the cases of borrowings from Aquinas by the Byzantine authors, especially as his name is not usually mentioned when he is quoted. Establishing a critical edition of all these translations is the task currently undertaken by an international team under the supervision of John Demetracopoulos and Charalambos Dendrinos in the research project *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus*.⁶

Within this framework, I am personally in charge of a short Thomistic treatise: Thomas Aquinas' *De Rationibus Fidei* (DRF) is a succinct exposition of the sound prin-

cially Augustine's *De Trinitate*, which was not previously available in Greek: see Aug., *Trin.*, ed. M. Papathomopoulos, I. Tsabare, G. Rigotti, Athens 1995. He also translated philosophical treatises such as Boethius' *De consolatione philosophiae*: see Boet., *Cons.*, ed. M. Papathomopoulos, Athens 1999.

³ About Demetrios Kydones' translations, see especially Kianka 1982, Glycofrydi-Leontsini 2003a, and J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010b. The two brothers did not translate only works by Thomas Aquinas, but also Augustine (see Aug., *Arb.*, ed. H. Hunger, Wien 1990), Anselm of Canterbury (unedited), Riccoldo Da Montecroce (see Ric., *Leg.*) and other theologians.

⁴ For the main studies about Thomism in Byzantium, see Papadopoulos 1967c, Papadopoulos 1974, Fyrigos 2004b, J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010b, J. A. Demetracopoulos 2012g, and Plested 2012g.

⁵ Only five volumes have been published (15, 16, 17A, 17B and 18) with title *Δημητρίου Κυδώνη Θωμᾶ Ακυνιάτου Σούμμα θεολογική ἐξελληνισθεῖσα* between 1976 and 2002 within the series *Corpus philosophorum Graecorum recentiorum*, in Athens, under the supervision of E. Moutsopoulos: they correspond to a partially critical edition of the first half of *ST*, IIa IIae.

⁶ *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* (<http://www.elemedu.upatras.gr/labart/dimitr/index1.html>) is an international research project dedicated to the publication of critical editions of all the works of Thomas Aquinas translated into Greek in the 14th and 15th centuries (almost all of them unedited), as well as all the Byzantine treatises written in the 14th and 15th centuries in support of or against Aquinas (some of them unedited). All volumes will be published in a subseries of the *Series Graeca* of the *Corpus Christianorum* published by Brepols Publishers (<http://www.arts.kuleuven.be/byzantium/english/ccsg>). See the presentation of the project in J. A. Demetracopoulos 2012c, 101–124, and the report of the progress and activities of the project during the last two years in J. A. Demetracopoulos and Dendrinos 2014, 13–22.

ciples of the Christian faith composed around 1260.⁷ It is an apologetic treatise against the Muslims, the Armenians and the Greeks, and its fourth chapter is especially dedicated to the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit. Two 14th-century Greek versions of this text are extant, which is an exceptional phenomenon among the Byzantine translations of Thomistic works. Ten manuscripts containing these translations have so far been identified (the text's length varies from 14 to 26 folios depending on the manuscripts). Version A, to be found in 5 manuscripts, was made by Demetrios Kydones, the most famous translator of Aquinas' treatises in the second half of the fourteenth century. The most complete title of his version (version A) is: "Ten chapters by the blessed Thomas addressed to a certain Cantor of Antioch, translated from the Latin language into Greek by kyr Demetrios Kydones" (Τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Θωμᾶ κεφάλαια δέκα πρός τινα ψάλτην Ἀντιοχείας, μετενεγχθέντα ἀπὸ τῆς Λατίνων γλώττης εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα παρὰ κυροῦ Δημητρίου τοῦ Κυδώνη). Version B is also preserved in 5 manuscripts, without any date, and can be attributed to a hitherto unknown translator of Aquinas named Atoumes. The most complete title of this other version is: "Treatise about the reasons for the faith composed by brother Thomas from Aquino to the Cantor of Antioch" (Διάληψις περὶ τῶν λόγων τῆς πίστεως ἐκδοθεῖσα παρ' ἀδελφοῦ Θωμᾶ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀχίνου πρὸς ψάλτην Ἀντιοχέα).⁸ I will present the information that I have been able to collect so far about each version, and then I will draw a very brief comparison between some passages of the two translations.

Dating

We know little about the chronology of Kydones' translations, except that he finished *SG* in 1354 and *ST I^a* in 1358.⁹ In the manuscripts which contain Kydones' translation of *DRF*, there is no marginal note to indicate the date of its composition. Nevertheless, one manuscript seems to be very close to and possibly contemporary with Kydones' work: it is *Marcianus gr. app. II*, 9 (coll. 1438). It contains 318 ff., the translation of *DRF* extends through ff. 298^r–317^r. This manuscript was described first by Mioni and recently by Kislas:¹⁰ it contains several anti-unionist treatises by Nilus Kabasilas, some

⁷ See the Latin critical edition supervised by the *Commissio Leonina*: Thom. Aquin., *DRF*, ed. H.-F. Dondaine, Roma 1968, B57–B73. See also the German translation by L. Hagemann and R. Gleis, the English translation by J. Kenney and the French translation based on this edition by G. Emery.

⁸ About these two versions, see Papadopoulos 1967c, 56–60.

⁹ Glycofrydi-Leontsini 2003a, 178 (with the quoted bibliography); Fyrigos 2004b, 32. For the place of Kydones' translations within the context of the history of Byzantine Thomism, see J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010b, 829–847.

¹⁰ Mioni 1967, 92–94; Nil Kab., *Spir.*, ed. T. Kislas, Paris 2001, 159–161.

documents related to the so-called “Photian council” in 880,¹¹ one anti-Latin treatise by Barlaam, and Kydones’ translation of *DRF*. It is remarkable to find a translation of Thomas Aquinas in such an anti-Latin collection of texts. Kislas stated that this manuscript belonged to the library of the Dominican monastery of Saints John and Paul at Constantinople, and had been copied between 1362 and 1364.¹² He confused the Constantinopolitan monastery with the convent of Saints John and Paul (San Zanipolo) at Venice: the manuscript was in fact kept in the library of this Venetian convent before being transferred to the Marciana Library in 1789.¹³ But we have no information about the place where it was copied. Kislas’ dating is also doubtful, as it is based on a misinterpretation of the data provided by the watermarks: he himself explains that there are seven watermarks used within the manuscript, whose dating range from 1347 to 1371.¹⁴ Moreover, the same watermarks are to be found in different parts of the manuscript, in the beginning as well as in the end, where *DRF* is contained. So it is impossible to assume that *DRF* would belong to a fully independent codicological unit, which would in the end have been bound into that manuscript.¹⁵ We therefore cannot assign a precise date for the production of this manuscript: it must be dated to the third quarter of the 14th century, which is not much help in giving a precise *terminus ante quem* for Kydones’ translation of *DRF*.

Strange as it may seem, we have much more information about version B, because this translation was used by two authors from the mid-fourteenth century. First, this version of *DRF* was refuted by a strongly anti-Latin polemicist, Matthew Angelos Panaretos.¹⁶ Very little is known of Panaretos: he lived in Constantinople in the mid-fourteenth century and produced abundant anti-Latin literature, including a treatise against the *Filioque* which consists of a linear refutation of Chapter IV of *DRF*,¹⁷ and another treatise against the doctrine of purgatory which likewise is a response to Chap-

¹¹ About the use of such documentation in the anti-Latin polemics during the 14th century, see Fanelli 2016.

¹² Nil Kab., *Spir.*, 159–160 Kislas: “ce manuscrit provient de la Bibliothèque du Monastère dominicain Saints-Jean-et-Paul à Constantinople. Il a été écrit entre 1362 et 1364 par un copiste principal et deux copistes secondaires”. Kislas (161) adds that *DRF* was copied lastly: “V^e étape (ff. 298–317): le copiste a terminé son travail avec la traduction de Thomas d’Aquin et le florilège patristique”.

¹³ Jackson 2011, 8; 18, n° 64; 69–70, n° 45. This manuscript was part of the first list of manuscripts personally acquired by the Dominican Gioachino Torriano before his death in 1500 (n° 64), so it entered Zanipolo before that date. It remained there afterwards and is mentioned in the inventory made by Giovanni Filippo Tomasini (n° 45) in the mid-seventeenth century.

¹⁴ See Nil Kab., *Spir.*, 160 n. 28 and 31 Kislas.

¹⁵ The same argument applies to the copyists, especially the main one who copied folios in the beginning as well as in the end of the manuscript. See also Jackson 2011, 18: “The several parts of Marc. II, 9 were all done at the same place and close to the same time”.

¹⁶ About Panaretos, see PLP 21649. See especially Risso 1914–1916, Buda 1956, Blanchet 2012.

¹⁷ This treatise was published in a non-critical edition based on one only manuscript and translated into Italian in Pan., *Proc.*, ed. C. Buda, in *Archivio storico per la Calabria e la Lucania* 26 (1957), 291–323; 27 (1958), 3–33.

ter IX of *DRF*.¹⁸ Now, the Greek version used by Panaretos for his two refutations was not that of Demetrius Kydones, but the other translation, version B. No historian until now has tried to identify the Greek text used by Panaretos, not even Buda, the editor of his treatise against the *Filioque*. Since Panaretos quotes verbatim many passages from Aquinas' text, it is very easy to compare the manuscripts of the two versions in order to identify which translation he used: it is that of version B both for Chapter IV of *DRF* and for chapter IX.¹⁹

Another mention of this translation is made in the treatise by Nilus Kabasilas *On the procession of the Holy Spirit*, also an antithomistic treatise in which Nilus strove to refute the Latin syllogisms with systematic counterarguments.²⁰ The author quotes *SG* and *ST* several times according to Demetrius Kydones' translation; but he also refers in one case to *DRF* by explicitly mentioning it with its long title: "About the reasons for the faith to the Cantor of Antioch" (Περὶ τῶν τῆς πίστεως λόγων πρὸς τὸν ψάλτην Ἀντιοχέα).²¹ His quotation of *DRF* in his text is as follows: οὕτως ἡ ἡμετέρα πίστις ἀναγκαῖοις λόγοις δείκνυσθαι οὐ δύναται, ὅτι τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνει.²² As noted by E. Candal, it corresponds to Chapter 2 of *DRF* and it stands for the Latin sentence: "sicut fides nostra necessariis rationibus probari non potest quia humanam mentem excedit [...]",²³ that is "just as our faith cannot be proved by necessary reasons, because it exceeds human mind". This Greek translation is that of version B, as we can find it for instance in *Marcianus gr.* 147, fol. 1v. By comparison, the translation by Kydones in version A gives the following text: ὥσπερ ἀδύνατον τὴν πίστιν ἀναγκαῖοις λόγοις ἀποδειχθῆναι, ὡσάν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνουσαν.²⁴

The fact that Nilus Kabasilas also used version B allows us now to determine a *terminus ante quem* for the translation, since Nilus died in 1363 and wrote his own treatise between 1358 and 1361.²⁵ In fact, one could hesitate between 1361 and 1363 for the completion of Nilus' treatise, but it seems more likely, as proposed by Kislas, that Nilus had completed his work before going to Thessaloniki, where he held the Metropolitan see from the end of 1361 or the beginning of 1362 on. This fact provides also additional information: though we are almost completely ignorant as to the context in which Panaretos was working, we do know much more about Nilus. He was in Constantinople when he wrote his treatise, so he must have had access to the translations

¹⁸ This treatise is still unpublished: I am preparing its critical edition, and also a critical reedition of the above quoted Panaretos' treatise about *Filioque*, within the framework of the project *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* (cf. *supra* n. 6 on p. 116).

¹⁹ The translation of version B differs clearly from that of Kydones: see an example below.

²⁰ About Nilus Kabasilas, see *PLP* 10102. For the edition of his treatises, see *Nil Kab., Proc.*, ed. E. Candal, Città del Vaticano 1945 and *Nil Kab., Spir.* Kislas.

²¹ *Nil Kab., Proc.*, 206, 24–25 Candal.

²² *Nil Kab., Proc.*, 206, 25–26 Candal.

²³ *Nil Kab., Proc.*, 207, n. 1, Candal. See *Thom. Aquin., DRF*, B 58 Dondaine.

²⁴ *Marcianus gr. app.* II, 9 (coll. 1438), fol. 299v.

²⁵ See *Nil Kab., Spir.*, 83–84 Kislas.

of Thomas Aquinas' works while he was there. Demetrius Kydones was his former pupil, therefore Nilus was certainly able to obtain many Thomistic texts through him: in his *Apologia*, Kydones informs us that he had indeed provided Nilus with Thomistic works.²⁶ This suggests that Nilus may not have directly got a copy of version B, but perhaps through Kydones, via a manuscript copied for him.

In this respect, *Marcianus gr. 147*, which will be fully described by Athanasopoulos,²⁷ is a very interesting case. As explained by Athanasopoulos, this manuscript was commissioned by Kydones from the copyist with whom he worked mostly, namely Manuel Tzykandyles.²⁸ Now I would like to insist on the fact that this manuscript contains a translation of *ST I^a II^{ae}* by Kydones (ff. 17^r–491^v) as well as version B of *DRF* (ff. 1^r–14^v). So this translation of *DRF* by an hitherto unknown author was also copied by Manuel Tzykandyles,²⁹ most probably for Demetrius Kydones. This means that Kydones must have been interested in this other translation of *DRF* and had access to it. It is too early at this stage of my research to be able to say whether Kydones might have known and used this translation when he composed his own: it is impossible at this point to establish which one of the two translations was first produced. In any case, version B circulated in the same scholarly milieu as Kydones' translations, namely in our case through Nilus Kabasilas and Manuel Tzykandyles.

To sum up, we know that version B was available in Constantinople before 1361. Neither Nilus Kabasilas nor Matthew Angelos Panaretos mentioned the author of the translation they used. The text was transmitted to the circle of the latinophile intellectuals of the capital through the same distribution channels as Kydones' translations. However, these indications do not help much in determining the date and place of the composition of version B. Indeed, it could be Constantinople in the 1350s, but we cannot completely exclude the possibility that it was composed somewhere else, although it is very unlikely, even possibly before the discovery of Thomas Aquinas' works in Constantinople in the 1350s.

²⁶ Dem. Kyd., *Apol.*, ed. G. Mercati, Città del Vaticano 1931, 391, 28–31.

²⁷ Within the research project *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus*, Panagiotis Athanasopoulos is in charge of the critical edition of Demetrios Kydones' translation of *ST I^a II^{ae}*. One of the main manuscripts of this translation is also *Marcianus gr. 147*, and Athanasopoulos already presented some information about it in his lecture during the conference in Stockholm, which he will publish within the framework of his critical edition. See also Mioni 1981a, 207–208.

²⁸ About Manuel Tzykandyles, see Mondrain 2004a, 250–263.

²⁹ As shown by Athanasopoulos, Manuel Tzykandyles himself was the copyist in charge of the first part of the manuscript.

The translator of version B

I owe many thanks to my colleagues Demetracopoulos and Athanasopoulos who informed me, when they examined the above mentioned *Marcianus gr.* 147 in the Marciana Library in Venice, that there was a very interesting marginal note concerning the translator. In this manuscript, on fol. 1r, one can indeed read in the margin the following sentence: “this translation from Latin is by Atoumes” (αὕτη ἡ ἐκ τοῦ λατινικοῦ ἔρμηνεία τοῦ Ἀτούμη ἐστίν). In this sentence, Atoumes is obviously a proper name, the name of the translator. This information was until now unpublished (E. Mioni did not transcribe this marginal note in his catalogue)³⁰ and it arouses some perplexity at first: no Atoumes is known within the circle of the Kydones brothers or more generally in the milieu of the Byzantine intellectuals who were interested in Latin culture.

So who could Atoumes be? This is a tricky prosopographical problem that I will not treat in detail here,³¹ but only touch upon briefly. The Atouemai were an old, well-known family coming from Armenia, who entered into an alliance with Emperor Basil II in the 11th century and then became a genuine aristocratic Byzantine family.³² It seems that the name Atoumes could be a variant of Atouemes, both names coming from the Armenian first name Atom: there still remains a debate among the specialists,³³ but from an onomastic point of view, the two patronymic names are close and can be related.

My research was first of all based on *PLP* and also on other sources, where I finally found 12 personages named either Atouemes or Atoumes who were active during the 14th century.³⁴ There is no evidence to suggest that any of these individuals could have known Latin and been able to perform a translation. Even when we examine this list in greater detail in order to focus at least on those who seem to have had an intellectual activity, we can find only two copyists of liturgical manuscripts,³⁵ one of the sons of

³⁰ Mioni 1981a, 207–208. Now see Blanchet 2016, 17–37.

³¹ For more details see Blanchet 2016, 25–37.

³² See Cheynet 2006, 219–226. In the 14th century, they were not any more linked to Armenia, their name only might have recalled their Armenian origin.

³³ See Jordanov 2006, 71–72, n° 68 and Cheynet and Théodoridis 2010, 36–38, n° 24 and 25.

³⁴ See Blanchet 2016, 26.

³⁵ *PLP* 1643 and *PLP* 1645 (*Ἀτουέμης Κωνσταντῖνος* and *'Ατουέμης Μιχαήλ*): two brothers, known as copyists in Crete in 1310 according to a note in *Patmiacus* 891, fol. 289v.

Theodore Metochites,³⁶ one anti-Palamite named Theodore Atouemes³⁷ and one otherwise unknown correspondent of John Chortasmenos in 1407.³⁸ The best candidate within that list would be Theodore Atouemes, a very young man in 1351, when he was condemned as an anti-Palamite and went into exile in Cyprus: at that time, he was to become a scholar and a theologian, but we have no information concerning his life after he settled in Cyprus.³⁹

On the other hand, there is a famous intellectual who knew both Greek and Latin very well and who must have been familiar with scholastic theology: Simon Atoumanos, who was first a Byzantine monk at the Stoudios' monastery, then became a Latin bishop in Gerace in Calabria in 1348, and later the Latin archbishop of Thebes.⁴⁰ He was an accomplished translator, especially since he was the author of a Latin translation of *De cohibenda ira* by Plutarch, which he dedicated to Cardinal Pietro Corsini in 1373.⁴¹ Another important translation is attributed to him, namely the translation of the Bible from Hebrew into Greek, which can be found in *Marcianus gr. 7*.⁴² It must be added that Simon Atoumanos was also linked with the Byzantine Latinophile intellectuals, especially with Demetrios Kydones, and according to their correspondence, he stayed in Constantinople some time before 1364.⁴³ Simon Atoumanos would thus have the right profile, but he does not have the right name. The

36 PLP 1640 ('Ατουέμης Ἀλέξιος): he has to be identified with Alexios Laskaris Metochites (PLP 17977), who was not only *megas domestikos* in Constantinople in 1357, but also related to the emperor and a high-ranking member of the court. He was the son of Theodore Metochites, the famous *mesazon* in the reign of Andronikos II: for this identification, see Estangüi Gómez 2014, 307, n. 119. Alexios Atouemes Laskaris Metochites must have been involved in the project of the Union of the Churches in 1355: he is indeed mentioned, together with his two brothers, as having received a letter from Pope Innocent VI thanking him for his commitment to the Union in Constantinople: see Halecki 1930, 43–49. I am grateful to Raúl Estangüi Gómez for this information.

37 PLP 1642 ('Ατουέμης Θεόδωρος).

38 PLP 1649 ('Ατούμης).

39 Theodore Atouemes is mentioned in a letter of Gregory Akindynos (Akin, *Epist.*, ed. A. Constantinides Hero, Washington 1983, 204–209, Letter 49, here 208, 53–58), in the *Tome against the palamites* by Arsenius of Tyrus (Ars., *Tomus*, éd. I. Polemis, in *Jahrbuch der Österreichische Byzantinistik* 43 [1993], 261, 241–242) and in a *Dialogue* by Philotheus of Selymbria (Phil., *Dial.*, ed. M. Bakalopoulou, Athens 1992, 251–254). See also documents edited by Mercati 1931d, 222–223, and Darrouzès 1959, 17.

40 See PLP 1648; Fedalto 2007.

41 Fedalto 2007, 155.

42 See Mercati 1916. This attribution is still confirmed by subsequent bibliography: D. De Crom wrote recently in this sense a "Postscript: the authorship of the *Graecus Venetus* translation" in the end of his article: De Crom 2009, 299–301.

43 We possess three letters sent to him by Demetrios Kydones: Dem. Kyd., *Epist.*, éd. R.-J. Loenertz, Città del Vaticano 1956–1960, I, 125–128, n° 93; 139–141, n° 103; II, 117–123, n° 226 (German translation by F. Tinnefeld, Stuttgart 1982, I/2, 353–360, n° 59; 404–410, n° 69; and Stuttgart 1991, II, 145–155, n° 203). Letter 93 (59 in Tinnefeld) is dated from summer 1364 and refers to Atoumanos' recent stay in Constantinople.

name “Atouman” (Ατουμάν/Άτουμάνης, Άτουμάνου) was used by several Byzantine historians (for instance Nikephoros Gregoras, John Kantakuzenos and Kritoboulos of Imbros) to refer to the Ottoman emirs, especially Osman (Othman), the founder of the dynasty.⁴⁴ It was thought to be a name of Turkish origin,⁴⁵ and it is documented in Byzantium.⁴⁶ From the onomastic point of view, it thus seems difficult to identify the name Atoumes (or Atouemes) with Atoumanos.

Thus, it remains impossible to uncover the identity of the translator Atoumes. Let us hope that future progress in the research on the Greek translations of Thomas Aquinas’ works will help to resolve this question.

Elements for a comparison of the two translations

Finally, I will briefly deal with the texts themselves. The existence of two different Greek versions from the same period, both unpublished, will offer the rare opportunity to compare them and observe in detail the choices of each translator. Which rendering of Aquinas’ vocabulary do these translations display? Could some of his terms have given rise to misinterpretation? Do both translations come up against the same difficulties? Only a thorough analysis of the method of each translator will enable us to answer these questions, so for the moment I will just examine a few passages of the two translations and focus on the choice and consistency of the technical vocabulary and the literal or paraphrastic character of the translations.

The sentence quoted by Nilus Kabasilas, the example I mentioned previously, is quite significant (see Table 1 on p. 124).⁴⁷

We find in this sentence some technical words which are translated in the same way by both translators, as is almost always the case throughout the two translations: “fides” is translated as “πίστις”; “ratio” as “λόγος”; “necessarius” as “ἀναγκαῖος”; “humanus” as “ἀνθρώπινος”; there could have been several choices for “mens”, but the word is translated in the two versions as “διάνοια” (whereas “voūς” is usually used for “intellectus”); and “excedit” is also translated with the same Greek verb “ὑπερβαίνω”. So it is obvious that both translators respect a constant technical vocabulary, apparently the same. In this sentence, the differences are only syntactic:

⁴⁴ See the examples given by Mercati 1916, 26–27.

⁴⁵ Simon Atoumanos was reputed to have had a Turkish father: in a letter dated to 11th September 1380, Peter IV of Aragon insisted that pope Urban VI should remove Atoumanos from the archbishopric of Thebes, and he added that “the archbishop was himself born in Constantinople, and his father was a Turk and his mother a schismatic” (“archiepiscopus ipse de Constantinopoli ortus est paterque eius fuit turcus et mater eius cismatica”). This could be mere slander coming from Peter IV of Aragon.

⁴⁶ There are two other persons named Atoumanos in the 14th century in *PLP*: see *PLP* 1646 and *PLP* 1647. See Fedaldo 2007, 175.

⁴⁷ See *supra* n. 22, 23 and 24.

Table 1

Latin	Version A (Kydones)	Version B (Atoumes)
“sicut fides nostra necessariis rationibus probari non potest quia humanam mentem excedit...”	ώσπερ ἀδύνατον τὴν πίστιν ἀναγκαῖοις λόγοις ἀποδειχθῆναι, ώστὲν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνουσαν...	οὕτως ἡ ἡμετέρα πίστις ἀναγκαῖοις λόγοις δείκνυσθαι οὐ δύναται, ὅτι τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνει...

“ἀδύνατον” in version A stands for “οὐ δύναται” in version B, which is closer to the Latin “non potest”. In version B, the expression “ὅτι τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνει” is an exact imitation of the Latin “quia humanam mentem excedit”, word for word, even if in Greek this structure does not sound completely natural; version A employs there a participial phrase, as would normally be expected in Greek: ώστὲν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνουσαν. In this case, there is no problem concerning the meaning of the sentence. Both translators understood correctly the Latin text and both are also very close to the text: they translated *ad verbum* without losing the meaning of the text.⁴⁸

I will now give an example where this is not the case (*DRF*, Chapter 1, see Table 2 on p. 125). As illustrated in Table 2, the translator of version B did not correctly understand the whole sentence, as he considered “quod ex libero dependet arbitrio” to be an object clause of the verb “asseris”. So because of this mistranslation, the meaning is lost and the sentence is nonsense. He also chose to translate “meritum” by “πολιτείαν”: this word usually means rather “way of life”, but in patristic literature it could also have the sense of “good deeds”, which is much closer.⁴⁹

The translator of version A, i. e. Kydones, understood somewhat better, but his translation of “merit” is also rather loose: he used “ἀνταποδόσεις”, that is “rewards”, to translate “merit”, whereas he used “ἀύτεξούσιον” for “free will”, which is correct. He also introduced the notion of “providence” (προορισμός), which was not explicit in the Latin text. The general meaning of the sentence is not as bad as in version B, but in this case, Kydones did not remain so close to the text and chose instead to translate *ad sententiam*. We must notice that there is an addition in his version of the text: “οὐκ ὀλίγην εἴναι τὴν πλάνην” (“the error is not a small one”): it might not be due to him, as he usually does not add phrases to the original text, but to his Latin model, which

48 According to Glycofrydi-Leontsini 2003a, 182, this is generally Kydones’ method of translation, that is, a translation *ad sententiam*, since his primary concern was to capture the meaning of Aquinas’ text, and if possible also a translation word for word, *ad verbum*.

49 See Estienne 1851–1865, VI/2, col. 1350 C, s.v. πολιτεία: “Porro πολιτείας nomine saepe intelliguntur quae solent Theologi bona opera appellare”.

Table 2

Latin Thom. Aquin., DRF, B57	Version A (Kydones) <i>Marcianus gr. app. II, 9 (coll. 1438), fol. 299r</i>	Version B (Atoumes) Marc. <i>gr. 147, f. 1v</i>
“Circa meritum vero quod ex libero dependet arbitrio, asseris tam Saracenos quam nationes alias necessitatem actibus humanis imponere ex praescientia vel ordinatione divina...”	διισχυρίζῃ [...] ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τὰς τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου ἡρημένας ἀνταποδόσεις, τοῖς τε ἄλλοις καὶ τοῖς σαρακηνοῖς οὐκ δίλιγην εἶναι τὴν πλάνην, τὸν θεῖον προορισμὸν ἢ τὴν πρόγνωσιν λέγουσι ταῖς ἀνθρωπίναις πράξεσιν ἀνάγκην ἐπιτιθέναι...	Περὶ τὴν πολιτείαν δὲ διαβεβαιοῦ ὡς ἔξ ἐλευθέρας γνώμης ἐξήρτηται τοσοῦτον τοὺς σαρακηνοὺς ὅσον καὶ ἄλλας γενεὰς ἀνάγκην ταῖς ἀνθρωπείαις πράξεσι ἐπιτιθέναι ἐκ τῆς προγνώσεως ἢ διατάξεως τῆς θείας...
“Concerning merit, which depends on free will, you assert that the Muslims as well as the other nations assign a necessity to human actions because of God's foreknowledge or decree...”	“You state [...] that, also concerning the rewards that depend on free will, the error made by the others as well as the Muslims is not a small one: they say that God's providence or foreknowledge assigns a necessity to human actions...”	“Concerning the way of life, you assert that it depends on free opinion that the Muslims as well as the other nations (should) assign a necessity to human actions because of God's foreknowledge or decree ...”

may have had a text similar to “non parvum esse errorem”.⁵⁰ This could then be a sign that the two translators did not work from the same Latin model.

In conclusion, the process of translating Latin works into Greek was in itself a sign of deep curiosity in Byzantium towards Western thought. As far as Thomas Aquinas himself is concerned, this phenomenon even reached a form of fascination for his work and method, since he was the Latin theologian by far the most translated into Greek during the medieval era. One of the challenges we face, while editing and commenting on these texts, is to analyze how Aquinas' thought was understood through these translations and how it could then be used and quoted by Byzantine theologians from across the religious spectrum, even the fiercest anti-Latins. This analysis will enable us better to understand how Thomas Aquinas' writings entered the Byzantine intellectual universe, to appraise the long-lasting continuities and the changes in such a phenomenon of acculturation, and to assess with more accuracy the conflicting

⁵⁰ There is no mention of such an addition in the *apparatus* of the Latin critical edition (Thom. Aquin., DRF, B57), so it will require an in-depth analysis within the Latin manuscript tradition.

potential of these intercultural contacts, characterized both by borrowing and rejection.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abbreviations

DRF	Thomas Aquinas, <i>De Rationibus Fidei</i> .
PLP	<i>Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit</i> , erstellt von E. Trapp, Wien 1979–1996.
SG	Thomas Aquinas, <i>Summa contra Gentiles</i> .
ST	Thomas Aquinas, <i>Summa Theologiae</i> .

Primary Sources

Akin, <i>Epist.</i>	<i>Letters of Gregory Akindynos</i> , ed. A. Constantinides Hero, Washington 1983.
Ars., <i>Tomus</i>	Arsenius of Tyrus, <i>Tome against the palamites</i> , in I. Polemis, <i>Arsenius of Tyrus and his Tome against the palamites</i> , in <i>Jahrbuch der Österreichische Byzantinistik</i> 43 (1993), 241–281.
Aug., <i>Arb.</i>	<i>Prochoros Kydones' Übersetzungen von S. Augustinus</i> , De libero arbitrio I 1–90 und Ps. <i>-Augustinus</i> , De decem plagis Aegyptiorum, ed. H. Hunger, Wien 1990 (<i>Wiener Studien</i> . Beiheft, 14).
Aug., <i>Trin.</i>	<i>Aύγουστίνου Περὶ Τριάδος βιβλία πεντεκαίδεκα ἄπερ ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετήνεγκε Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης, εισαγωγή, ελληνικό και λατινικό κείμενο, γλωσσάριο</i> , editio princeps M. Papathomopoulos, I. Tsabare, G. Rigotti, Athens 1995.
Boet., <i>Cons.</i>	<i>Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii De consolatione philosophiae: traduction grecque de Maxime Planude</i> , éd. critique du texte grec avec une introd., le texte latin, les scholies et des index par M. Papathomopoulos, Athens 1999 (<i>Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi. Commentaria in Aristotelem byzantina</i> , 9).
Dem. Kyd., <i>Apol.</i>	Demetrios Kydones, <i>Apologia I</i> , in Mercati 1931, 359–403.
Dem. Kyd., <i>Epist.</i>	Démétrius Cydonès, <i>Correspondance</i> , ed. R.-J. Lœnertz, Città del Vaticano 1956–1960, 2 vol. (german translation by F. Tinnefeld, Stuttgart 1981–2003, 5 vol.).
Nil Kab., <i>Proc.</i>	<i>Nilus Cabasilas et theologia s. Thomae de processione Spiritus Sancti</i> , ed. E. Candal, Città del Vaticano 1945.
Nil Kab., <i>Spir.</i>	Nil Cabasilas, <i>Sur le Saint-Esprit</i> , ed. T. Kislas, Paris 2001.
Pan., <i>Proc.</i>	Matthew Panaretos, <i>De processione</i> , in C. Buda, <i>Il tomismo a Bisanzio nel secolo XIV. Una polemica bizantina del secolo XIV</i> , in <i>Archivio storico per la Calabria e la Lucania</i> 26 (1957), 291–323; 27 (1958), 3–33.
Phil., <i>Dial.</i>	<i>Φιλόθεος Σηλυβρίας. Βίος καὶ συγγραφικό ἔργο</i> , ed. M. Bakalopoulou, Athens 1992.

Ric., <i>Leg.</i>	Riccoldo da Montecroce, <i>Contra legem Sarracenorum</i> , in <i>PG</i> 154, 1035–1070.
Thom. Aquin., <i>DRF</i>	Thomas Aquinas, <i>De Rationibus Fidei ad Cantorem Antiochenum</i> , ed. H.-F. Dondaine, in <i>Opera omnia</i> , 40, pars B, Roma 1968 (Editio Leonina), B57–B73 (German translation by L. Hagemann and R. Gle, Altenberge 1987 [Corpus islamo-christianum, Series latina 2]; English translation by J. Kenney, in <i>Islamochristiana</i> 22 [1996], 31–52; French translation by G. Emery, Paris 1999).

Secondary Sources

Blanchet, M.-H. (2012). “Éliminer Thomas d'Aquin: le projet antithomiste de Matthieu Ange Panarétois”. In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*, 37. *Kölner Mediaevistentagung*, Köln 14–17 September 2010. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 36. Berlin, pp. 452–465.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2016). “Atoumès, un nouveau traducteur byzantin de Thomas d'Aquin”. In: *Koinotaton doron. Das späte Byzanz zwischen Machtlosigkeit und kultureller Blüte (1204–1461)*. Ed. by A. Berger et al. *Byzantinisches Archiv*, 31. Berlin, pp. 17–37.

Buda, C. (1956). “Influsso del tomismo a Bisanzio nel secolo XIV”. In: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 49, pp. 318–331.

Cameron, A. (2016). *Arguing it Out: Discussion in Twelfth-Century Byzantium*. The Natalie Zemon Davis Annual Lectures, 8. Budapest.

Cheynet, J.-C. (2006). “De Tziliapert à Sébastè”. In: *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* 9, pp. 213–226.

Cheynet, J.-C. and D. Théodoridis (2010). *Sceaux byzantins de la collection D. Théodoridis. Les sceaux patronymiques*. Paris.

Darrouzès, J. (1959). “Lettre inédite de Jean Cantacuzène relative à la controverse palamite”. In: *Revue des Études Byzantines* 17, pp. 7–27.

De Crom, D. (2009). “The Book of Canticles in Codex Graecus Venetus 7”. In: *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions. Studies in their Use in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Ed. by N. De Lange, J. G. Krivoruchko, and C. Boyd-Taylor. Texts and studies in medieval and early modern Judaism, 23. Tübingen, pp. 287–301.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2010b). “Demetrius Cydones' translation of Bernardus Guidonis' list of Thomas Aquinas' writings and the historical roots of Byzantine Thomism”. In: *1308. Eine Topographie historischer Gleichzeitigkeit*. Ed. by A. Speer and D. Wirmer. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 35. Berlin, pp. 829–881.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2012c). “The Influence of Thomas Aquinas on Late Byzantine philosophical and theological thought: À propos of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus Project*”. In: *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 54, pp. 101–124.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2012g). “Thomas Aquinas' Impact on Late Byzantine Theology and Philosophy: The Issues of Method or ‘Modus Sciendi’ and ‘Dignitas Hominis’”. In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*, 37. *Kölner Mediaevistentagung*, Köln 14–17 September 2010. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 36. Berlin, pp. 333–410.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. and C. Dendrinos (2014). “Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus”. In: *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 56, pp. 13–22.

Estangüi Gómez, R. (2014). “Les Tzamplakônes, grands propriétaires fonciers à Byzance au 14e siècle”. In: *Revue des Études Byzantines* 72, pp. 275–329.

Estienne, H. (1851–1865). *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae, post editionem anglicam novis additamentis auctum, ordineque alphabeticō digestum tertio ediderunt Carolus Benedictus Hase, Guilielmus Dindorfius et Ludovicus Dindorfius*. First edition 1572. Paris.

Fanelli, M. (2016). “Un’omelia inedita del patriarca Callisto I e l’uso dei testi conciliari foziani nella disputa contro i Latini alla metà del 14o secolo”. In: *Revue des Études Byzantines* 74, pp. 171–221.

Fedalto, G. (2007). *Simone Atumano. Monaco di Studio, arcivescovo latino di Tebe. Secolo XIV*. 2nd ed. Brescia.

Fyrigos, A. (2004b). “Tomismo e antitomismo a Bisanzio (con una nota sulla Defensio S. Thomae adversus Nilum Cabasilam di Demetrio Cidone)”. In: *Tommaso d’Aquino († 1274) e il mondo bizantino*. Ed. by A. Molle. Venafro, pp. 27–72.

Glycofrydi-Leontsini, A. (2003a). “Demetrios Cydones as a translator of Latin texts”. In: *Porphyrogenita. Essays on the history and literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in honour of Julian Chrysostomides*. Ed. by C. Dendrinos. Aldershot, pp. 175–185.

Halecki, O. (1930). *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*. Varsovie.

Jackson, D. (2011). *The Greek Library of Saints John and Paul (San Zanipolo) at Venice*. Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies. Medieval Renaissance Texts and Studies, 391. Tempe, Arizona.

Jordanov, I. (2006). *Corpus of Byzantine seals from Bulgaria. II, Byzantine seals with family names*. Sofia.

Kianka, F. (1982). “Demetrius Cydones and Thomas Aquinas”. In: *Byzantion* 52, pp. 264–286.

Mercati, G. (1916). *Se la versione dall’ebraico del codice Veneto Greco VII sia di Simone Atumano, arcivescovo di Tebe. Ricerca storica con notizie e documenti sulla vita dell’Atumano*. Rome.

Mercati, G. (1931d). *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo xiv*. Città del Vaticano.

Mioni, E. (1967). *Bibliotheca Divi Marci Venetiarum codices Graeci manuscripti. I, Pars prior: Classis I – Classis II, Codd. 1–120*. Roma.

Mioni, E. (1981a). *Bibliotheca Divi Marci Venetiarum codices Graeci manuscripti. I, Thesaurus antiquus, codices 1–299*. Roma.

Mondrain, B. (2004a). “L’ancien empereur Jean VI Cantacuzène et ses copistes”. In: *Gregorio Palamas e oltre: studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*. Ed. by A. Rigo. Firenze, pp. 249–296.

Papadopoulos, S. G. (1967c). Έλληνικαὶ μεταφράσεις θωμιστικῶν ἔργων. Φιλοθωμισταὶ καὶ ἀντιθωμισταὶ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ. Athens.

Papadopoulos, S. G. (1974). “Thomas in Byzanz. Thomas-Rezeption und Thomas-Kritik in Byzanz zwischen 1354 und 1453”. In: *Theologie und Philosophie* 49, pp. 274–304.

Plested, M. (2012g). *Orthodox readings of Aquinas*. Oxford.

Risso, P. (1914–1916). “Matteo Angelo Panareto e cinque suoi opusculi”. In: *Roma e l’Oriente* 8, 9, 10, 11, 8 (1914): 91–105, 162–179, 231–237, 274–290, 9 (1915): 112–120, 202–206, 10 (1915): 63–77, 146–164, 238–251, 11 (1916): 28–35, 76–80, 154–160.

John A. Demetracopoulos

Scholarios' *On Almsgiving*, or How to Convert a Scholastic "Quaestio" into a Sermon

1 Forschungsbericht

Gehrhard Podskalsky was the first to produce a considerable list of cases of the direct utilization of the *corpus Thomisticum* by Scholarios (*ca. 1400 – paulo post 1472*).¹ Building on M. Jugie's findings, and focusing almost exclusively on Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*,² Podskalsky pointed out around thirty such places in Scholarios' œuvre as edited by L. Petit, X.A. Sideridès and M. Jugie,³ nearly all of which are indeed Thomist in origin with some few exceptions.⁴ Aquinas' and Scholarios' corpora are so huge (each considered in the context of its own literary tradition) that no list can lay claim to exhaustiveness. Since the time of Podskalsky's article, more cases of direct Thomistic influence on Scholarios have been brought to light, and no doubt even more will be discovered. My intention here is to bring up the additional case of Scholarios' *Sermon*

¹ Podskalsky 1974b, 309–312.

² The only exception (*art. cit.*, 311, n. 38) is Ps.-Aquinas' *De sacramento Eucharistiae*, already noticed by M. Jugie (see L. Petit, M. Jugie, and X.A. Sideridès 1928, 129 ad l. 11; 131 ad l. 25; Jugie 1930a, 432), who shared the then common view that this was a genuine Thomistic work (ed. Busa 1980, 684–687 = T1450–1540 in: R. Schönberger, A. Quero Sánchez, B. Berges, L. Jiang and A. Schönfeld 2011, 3678 ad tit.; 3849–3850 ad tit.).

³ L. Petit, X.A. Sideridès and M. Jugie 1928–1936.

⁴ Podskalsky was mistaken in his suggestions regarding Scholarios' bulky handbook of *Ars vetus* (tome VII, 1–348). (a) 18, 29–20, 5 is not paralleled in *Summa theologiae*, Ia, qu. 83, art. 1 and Ia IIae, qu. 17, art. 2, because it fully coincides with I.1, 1–6 of Aquinas' *Commentary on Aristotle's Posterior Analytics*, which Scholarios had translated in full (see J. A. Demetracopoulos 2014b, 826; translation lost; cf. Podskalsky 1974b, 307). (b) 77, 18–21 includes a reference to *Summa theologiae*, Ia, qu. 75, art. 5. Still, with only few exceptions, the entire *Ars vetus* is not an original composition but a translation/adaptation, enriched with some notes and excursus by the translator (see Ebbesen and Pinborg 1981–1982a, 263–319; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010f, 88–89; Balcoyannopoulou in this volume), which means that, most probably, this explicit reference to Aquinas was part of the translated Latin text/.-s. (c) This holds true for 135, 24–26 (paralleled by Podskalsky with *Summa theologiae*, IIIa, qu. 32, art. 4), as well. (d) As for 300, 28–31, it is an endnote, so to speak, by Scholarios, in which he recommends to his students and/or readers *Summa theologiae*, Ia, qu. 14, art. 13 as further reading on the topic discussed (see Balcoyannopoulou, *art. cit.*, p. 110; cf. *infra*, p. 157, n. 163).

on Almsgiving (*Περὶ ἐλεημοσύνης*)⁵ considered in its entirety. Podskalsky himself⁶ noticed that, in one place, Scholarios utilised the corresponding article from Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*, i. e. II^a II^ae, qu. 32 ("Περὶ ἐλεημοσύνης"), art. 5 ("Εἰ τὸ διδόναι ἐλεημοσύνην ἐντολὴ ἔστι"). Focusing on par. 10 of the *Sermon*, he pointed out that the passage from Basil of Caesarea's *Homilia in illud; "Destruam horrea mea"* as quoted by Scholarios⁷ does not derive directly from the original Greek text but from Aquinas' citation of it (in ad 2^{um}). Indeed, Scholarios reproduces the passage in the form in which it stands in Demetrios Kydones' translation of II^a II^ae:

Basil of Caesarea, <i>Homilia in illud; "Destruam horrea mea"</i> , 7	Basil's passage in Demetrios Kydones' translation of Aquinas' <i>Summa theologiae</i> , II ^a II ^a e, qu. 32, art. 5 ad 2 ^{um} ; cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 117v, 36–118r, 4
<p>Εἰ δὲ ὁμολογεῖς [τὰ παρόντα σοι] εἶναι παρὰ Θεοῦ, εἰπὲ τὸν λόγον ἡμῖν, δι’ ὃν ἔλαβες. Μή ἄδικος ὁ Θεός, ὁ ἀνίσως ἡμῖν διαιρῶν τὰ τοῦ βίου; Διὰ τί σὺ μὲν πλούτεῖς, ἐκεῖνος δὲ πένεται; "Ἡ πάντως, ἵνα καὶ σὺ χρηστότητος καὶ πιστῆς οἰκονομίας μισθὸν ὑποδέξῃ, κάκεῖνος τοῖς μεγάλοις ἄθλοις τῆς ὑπομονῆς τιμῆτῇ; Σὺ δέ, πάντα τοῖς ὀπληρώτοις τῆς πλεονεξίας κόλποις περιλαβών, οὐδένα οἴει ἀδικεῖν τοσούτους ἀποστερῶν; Τίς ἔστιν ὁ πλεονέκτης; Ὁ μὴ ἐμμένων τῇ αὐταρκείᾳ. Τίς δέ ἔστιν ὁ ἀποστερήτης; Ὁ ἀφαιρούμενος τὰ ἔκαστου. Σὺ δέ οὐ πλεονέκτης; Σὺ δέ οὐκ ἀποστερήτης, ἀ πρὸς οἰκονομίαν ἔδέξω, ταῦτα ἴδια σεαυτοῦ ποιούμενος; "Ἡ ὁ μὲν ἐνδεδυμένον ἀπογυμνῶν 'λαποδύτης' ὄνομασθήσεται, ὁ δὲ τὸν γυμνὸν μὴ ἐνδύων, δυνάμενος τοῦτο ποιεῖν, ἄλλης τινός ἔστι προσγορίας ἄξιος; Τοῦ πεινῶντός ἔστιν ὁ ἄρτος, ὃν σὺ κατέχεις τοῦ γυμνητεύοντος τὸ ἴμάτιον, ὁ σὺ φυλάσσεις ἐν ἀποθήκαις τοῦ ἀνυποδέουτο τοῦ ὑπόδημα, ὁ παρὰ σοὶ κατασήπεται τοῦ χρήζοντος τὸ ἀργύριον, ὁ κατορύζας ἔχεις. "Ωστε τοσούτους ἀδικεῖς, ὅσοις παρέχειν ἥδυνασο.⁸</p>	<p>Εἰ ταῦθ’ ὁμολογεῖς θεόθεν προσγενέσθαι (τουτέστι τὰ πρόσκαιρα ἀγαθά), μὴ ἄδικος ὁ Θεός ἀνίσως τὰ πράγματα διανέμων ἡμῖν; Διατί σὺ μὲν περισσεύῃ, ἐκεῖνος δὲ προσαιτεῖ, εἰ μὴ ἵνα καὶ σὺ τῆς ἀγαθῆς οἰκονομίας τὸν μισθὸν ἀπολάβῃς κάκεῖνος τοῖς τῆς ὑπομονῆς βραβείοις στεφανωθῇ; Τοῦ πεινῶντός ἔστιν ὁ ἄρτος, ὃν σὺ δειπνεῖς, τοῦ γυμνοῦ, τὸ ἴμάτιον ὃ σὺ τηρεῖς ἐν τῷ κιβωτίῳ· τοῦ ἀνυποδέουτο τὸ ὑπόδημα, ὁ σήπεται παρὰ σοί· τοῦ δεομένου τὸ ἀργύριον, ὁ κέκτησαι μὴ ἀριθμῶν. "Οθεν τοσούτους ἀδικεῖς, ὅσοις παρέχειν δύνασαι."⁹</p>

⁵ Eds. Jugie et al., *op. cit.*, tome I, 91, 15–102, 7. This sermon is preserved in a well-known 16th century codex unicus (*Iber. 388 = Hagion Oros 4508*; see Jugie et al., tome I, XXXIX–XLI; 91). The sermon itself is not mentioned in S. Lambros' description (1900, 131). A new description of the manuscript is being prepared by Zissis Melissakis (National Hellenic Research Foundation, Athens).

⁶ Podskalsky 1974b, 312, n. 41.

⁷ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 99, 30–100, 2.

It would be improbable that a Greek author had recourse to a huge Latin text translated into Greek simply for the sake of quoting a passage from a well-known Greek Father. It makes more sense to assume that Scholarios came across this originally Greek passage while exploiting a large part of Thomas' work, which is what he often does elsewhere e. g., in making use of passages in Scripture, or from the corpus Aristotelicum or John of Damascus.¹⁰

2 Aquinas' *Summa theologiae* as the main source of Scholarios' Sermon

Indeed, Scholarios borrowed from Aquinas much more than simply this passage. Prior to the final three paragraphs¹¹ of the Sermon that attracted Podskalsky's attention, Scholarios had already made an extensive use of Aquinas' II^a II^{ae} throughout – in such a way that one can safely say that he deliberately turned Aquinas' *quaestio* on almsgiving into a sermon to deliver. In a nutshell, Scholarios built up his Sermon by drawing material from II^a II^{ae}, qu. 32, art. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 10 (including some Biblical and patris-

⁸ Ed. Courtonne 1935, 35, 9–24 (= PG 31: 276B–277A). Cf. Basil of Caesarea, *Sermones de moribus a Symeone Metaphrasta collecti*, PG 32: 1157C.

⁹ Cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 196, 25–197, 6. Cod. *Par. gr. 1237* counts 296 ff. (292 x 210). The fascicles (mostly quaternions, with some quinions and binions) are numbered from 1 [α'] to 37 [λζ]; sometimes the fascicle numbering is truncated, but no fascicle is missing. There is only one watermark used throughout the manuscript, which figures in full page (folded in folio) in one direction and then in the opposite direction, which means that there is no paper change when the hand changes. The watermark, scissors, is a motif of 65/66 mm in height, spacing chainlines 29 mm. It is close to Briquet 3681 (Siena, 1419) or 3663 (Prague, 1445), and very close, if not identical, to scissors Harlfinger 21 Nov. 1432, copied by Gregorios Bryennios, *Taur. XXIII (C-II-16)*, a copy of the *Summa contra Gentiles* ordered and owned by Scholarios; see *infra*, pp. 152–153. The manuscript contains Demetrios Kydones' translation of II^a II^{ae}; it was written by Scholarios (fol. 1–26v, 223–296v [fol. 255–256: blank], text; fol. 27–221, titles) and his collaborator George Baiophoros (see Gamillscheg, D. Harlfinger, and Hunger 1989, 48 and 54, Nos 74 and 92; Cataldi Palau 2008, 290). Qu. 65 to the end (i. e., including qu. 78 [fol. 230v–231r], which concerns us here, were abridged. Qu. 1–64, which make up 35% of II^a II^{ae}, are fully reproduced, occupying 75% of the manuscript, whereas qu. 65–179, which make up 65% of Thomas' text, occupy only 25% of the manuscript. The full version of II^a II^{ae} ends at qu. 65, art. 1 ad 3^{um} up to “πονηρῶν λογισμῶν”, whereas Scholarios' abridgment includes qu. 65, too. Since it is almost certain that Scholarios, while composing the *Sermon* under discussion, used this manuscript (see *infra*), which contains his own (partially identical and partially abridged) version of Kydones' translation of II^a II^{ae}, I quote here from this manuscript, adding, for practical reasons, references to the printed semi-critical edition mentioned in this note and in n. 3.4 on p. 173.

¹⁰ On Scholarios' taking liberties in extracting various Biblical, ancient Greek and Greek Patristic passages from the “Thomas Graecus”, see, e. g., J.A. Demetracopoulos 2007, 318–321; 329, n. 74; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2017d.

¹¹ According to the – not always fortunate – division of the *Sermon* in Jugie's edition.

tic material used by Aquinas), enriching it with additional material from qu. 10, art. 4, qu. 23, art. 6, qu. 26, art. 3–5, qu. 27, art. 8, qu. 30, art. 2 and 4, qu. 31, art. 2 and 3, qu. 32, art. 1, 2–7, 9 and 10, qu. 78, art. 1 and qu. 79, art. 1, as well as from I^a Pars, qu. 21, art. 3.¹² Appendix I offers a full picture of the indebtedness of Scholarios' Sermon to Aquinas. As can be seen, there is almost nothing in Scholarios' Sermon that is traceable back to the patristic literature on almsgiving.¹³

2.1 The Introductory Part of the Sermon

Paragraphs 1–3 form the introduction to the sermon. In a way typical of Byzantine sermons, Scholarios (par. 1) begins by quoting certain scriptural passages relevant to the topic. Connecting this sermon with the one he had delivered a week earlier about fasting (*Περὶ νηστείας*), these paragraphs¹⁴ indicate the vanity of fasting without charity. Scholarios summarizes what he had said in the previous sermon about the profits one can gain from fasting as follows: “[Ἡ νηστείᾳ] τὴν σάρκα καθαίρει καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἐπὶ τὰ θεῖα μετεωρίζει καὶ δίκη τις οἶον καὶ ποινὴ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἡμῖν γίνεται”.¹⁵ In the *Sermon on Fasting*, he had said:

Λυσιτελεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν [sc. ἡ νηστείᾳ] τὰ μέγιστα.

Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ πρὸς ἀπόχην τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς ἥδονῶν λυσιτελεῖ, καταστέλλουσα τὰς ἀτάκτους κινήσεις ἐν τῷ τὴν θέρμην σβεννύναι τῆς φύσεως· διὸ καὶ ἔλεγεν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος· «ἐν νηστείαις, ἐν ἀγνότητι» (II Cor. 6:6), ὡς τῆς «ἀγνότητος» δηλονότι διὰ τῶν «νηστειῶν» καὶ γινομένης ἡμῖν καὶ συντηρούμενης.

Δεύτερον, τὴν διάνοιαν ἡμῶν πρὸς τὴν θεωρίαν μετεωρίζει... Καὶ τοῦτο δηλοῖ Δανιὴλ (Dan. 10:2–3) μετὰ τὴν τῶν τριῶν ἑβδομάδων νηστείαν ἐκ Θεοῦ δεδεγμένος τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν.

Τρίτον, τὴν τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἄφεσιν ἡμῖν καταπράττεται, ἀντὶ ποινῆς ἡμῖν καὶ δίκης τελοῦσα, κατὰ τό· «έπιστρέψατε πρός με ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν, ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ κλαυθμῷ καὶ κοπετῷ» (Joel 2:12).¹⁶

¹² In the *corpus Thomisticum*, the issue of “eleemosyna” is treated in a way like that in II^a II^{ae} in Thomas' *Commentary on the Sentences*, Lib. IV, Dist. 15, qu. 2 and Ps.(?)-Thomas' *Sermo “Homo quidam erat dives”* (=T1450–1160/5 in: R. Schönberger et al., *op. cit.*, 3677; 3837). The issue of “usura” (see *infra*, pp. 146–146) is treated in a partly similar way in: (i) Thomas' *Commentary on the Sentences*, Lib. III, dist. 37, qu. 1, art. 6 (“Utrum usuras accipere sit peccatum”); (ii) Thomas' *Quaestiones disputatae de malo*, qu. 13, art. 4; (iii) Thomas' *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, qu. 3, art. 19; (iv) Ps.-Thomas' *De regimine principum ad regem Cyperi* II, 13–14; (T1450–780 in: Schönberger et al. 2011, 3813–16); and (v) Ps.-Thomas' (Aegidius de Lessinia's) *De usuris in communi et de usurarum contractis* (=T1450–1450 in Schönberger et al. 2011, 3679 and 3847). (On the texts on usury, see Gómez Pérez 1982, 17–21.) Scholarios' discussion of almsgiving and usury in the *Sermon* exhibits no traces of these texts at all.

¹³ On charitable contributions as a solution to the problem of social inequality in patristic thought, see Gordon 1989, 106–109.

¹⁴ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 91, 17–27. The scriptural passages are quoted according to the Septuagint.

¹⁵ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 91, 29–30.

¹⁶ Scholarios, *Περὶ νηστείας* 3 (*op. cit.*, 83, 15–27).

This is how Scholarios summarises the above in his personal copy of Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*, II^a II^{ae} (qu. 147, art. 1):

'Υπέρ τριῶν γάρ τις ἀναλαμβάνει τὴν νηστείαν·
 α' μὲν πρὸς ἀποχὴν τῆς σαρκός καὶ τῶν ταύτης ἡδονῶν· ὅθεν ὁ Ἀπόστολός φησιν, ὡς εἰρηται, «ἐν νηστείαις, ἐν ἀγνότητι», ὡς τῆς «ἀγνότητος» δηλαδὴ διὰ τῶν «νηστειῶν» συντηρουμένης·
 β' πρὸς τὸ τὴν διάνοιαν οὕτω πρὸς τὴν θεωρίαν μετεωρίζεσθαι· ὅθεν λέγεται ἐν τῷ δ' τοῦ Δανιήλ,
 ὅτι μετὰ τὴν τῶν τριῶν ἑβδομάδων νηστείαν τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἐδέξατο τοῦ Θεοῦ·
 γ' ὑπέρ ἀπαλλαγῆς καὶ ἰκανοποιήσεως τῶν ἴδιων ἀμαρτημάτων, ὡς λέγεται ἐν τῷ β' <Joel>· «ἐπι-
 στρέψατε πρός με ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν, ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ κλαυθμῷ καὶ κοπετῷ».¹⁷

As is obvious, the lines from the *Sermon on Almsgiving* were based on the lines from the *Sermon on Fasting*. As M. Jugie also noticed,¹⁸ Scholarios' *Sermon on Fasting* was heavily indebted to the relevant article (qu. 147: “Περὶ νηστείας”, art. 5: “Περὶ τοῦ ὄρισμοῦ τοῦ χρόνου τῶν νηστειῶν”) from Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*, II^a II^{ae}. Indeed, Scholarios used cod. *Par. gr. 1237* (see fol. C recto and 273v–274r), which was his personal copy of II^a II^{ae} (see *supra*, p. 131, n. 9). In the left margin of fol. 273v, Scholarios notes: “Περὶ τοῦ Τεσσαρακονθημέρου” (“On Lent”). This is how par. 6 of his *Sermon on Fasting* begins: “Διατί δὲ τεσσαρακονθήμερον τὴν νηστείαν ταύτην ποιεῖν κελευθμέθα;”¹⁹ The content can be fully traced back to this article. Likewise, in regard to par. 10–11 of the same *Sermon*,²⁰ Scholarios relied on qu. 148 (“Περὶ γαστριμαργίας”), art. 6.²¹ It should also not pass unnoticed that, in the first two of three scriptural references, Scholarios mentions the relevant sacred authors, i. e. Paul and Daniel, who are mentioned in cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, whereas the third reference is simply introduced by the vague phrase “κατὰ τό...”, presumably because, in the corresponding passage in cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, the name of the minor prophet Joel is not mentioned.

As we shall see, Scholarios' plan was to exploit his copy of Demetrios Kydones' translation of II^a II^{ae} for the composition of his *Sermon on Almsgiving* as well.²²

¹⁷ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 273r, 33–38. The Septuagint form of the Scriptural passage is different: «Ἐπι-
 στράφητε πρός με ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν καὶ ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ ἐν κλαυθμῷ καὶ ἐν κοπετῷ».

¹⁸ Jugie et al., tome I, 86, ad l. 6.

¹⁹ Eds. Jugie et. al., *op. cit.*, tome I, 86, 3–4.

²⁰ Eds. Jugie et. al., *op. cit.*, tome I, 89, 4–33.

²¹ See cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 274r–v.

²² One of the volumes of the Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus project (see bibliography) is planned to include the Scholarian sermons that depend heavily or almost exclusively on Aquinas. — As is known, one of the major sources of Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*, II^a II^{ae} was the Dominican Guilelmus Peraldus' (c. 1200 – 1271) *Summa de vitiis et virtutibus*, which was meant by his author/compiler to serve as a rich mine of sources for the preaching activity of the Dominicans (see A. Dondaine 1948; Mulchahey 1998, 541; Inglis 1999, 13, n. 13; 18–19; Oliva 2008–2009, 235; Corbett 2015, 390). I do not know if Scholarios, in turning Aquinas' *quaestiones* back to preaching material, was aware of Peraldus' *Summa* and its reception by Thomas. Vincent of Beauvais (c. 1190 – 1264), another author who exploited Peraldus a lot (see Steiner 1933 *in toto*), had become known to the Byzantine world thanks to a partial translation

Contrasting the above praise of fasting with God's repudiation of fasting improperly, that is, of the mere abstinence from certain foods, Scholarios argues for the superiority of almsgiving to fasting. To show this, he presents doing almsdeeds as a duty deriving from human nature as essentially directed toward a good beyond itself:

Οὐ γάρ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ζῶμεν ἔκαστος μόνον ὥσπερ ἀπόλυτον τι πρᾶγμα καὶ ἄφετον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν τετάγμεθα καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πλησίουν. Καὶ τὸ μὲν ἔαυτόν τινα ἔκαστον ἀγαπᾶν οὐδέ ἐντεταλμένον ὅλως ἔστιν («οὐδεὶς γάρ» «ἔαυτόν» «ποτε μεμίσκεν» [Eph. 5:29] νοῦν ἔχων), ἀλλὰ «τὸν Θεόν» «καὶ τὸν πλησίον» «ἀγαπᾶν» κελευθμεθα «έξ ὅλης τῆς ἡμετέρας ψυχῆς καὶ καρδίας καὶ διανοίας», τὸν μὲν Δημιουργὸν ἡμῶν ὑπέρ ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, «τὸν» δὲ «πλησίον» «ώς ἔαυτόν» [Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18; 19:34; Mt. 19:19; 22:37–39; Mc. 12:30–31; Lc. 10:27; Rom. 13:9; Gal. 5:14; Jac. 2:8] ἔκαστος.²³

This is a simplified version of some of the main points in Aquinas' qu. 26 ("Περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν ἀγαπητῶν").²⁴ Scholarios takes for granted that a sane person possesses self-love, whereas this is not necessarily so in regard to one's love of God, whom one is commanded to love more than oneself, and in regard to one's fellowmen, whom one is commanded to love as much as oneself. The first clause ("Καὶ τὸ μὲν ... ἔχων") is put by Aquinas in this way: "Παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐπίκειται φροντὶς τοῦ ἴδιου σώματος" (II^a II^{ae}, qu. 26, art. 5 ad 3^{um}).²⁵ As Scholarios correctly understood, this is a paraphrase of Eph. 5:29: "Οὐδεὶς γάρ ποτε τὴν ἔαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίστησεν"; this is why he rephrased Thomas' formulation by using a more Pauline one. As for the addition of the conditional "νοῦν ἔχων", this is simply an implicit reference to self-destruction or suicide considered as insanity ("ἀπόνοια"). Self-love is taken for granted in qu. 25, art. 7, Resp., too:

...Τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τινα ὅπερ ἔαυτὸν εἶναι νομίζει κοινόν ἐστι πᾶσιν. ...Πάντες ἀνθρωποι ... ἀγαπῶσιν ἔαυτούς, καθόσον ἀγαπῶσι τὴν ἔαυτῶν συντήρησιν.²⁶

In fact, Aquinas quotes Eph. 5:29 twice in Part Two of the *Summa theologiae*. In I^a II^{ae}, qu. 29, art. 4 ("Περὶ τοῦ μίσους"), he argues that, properly speaking, self-hate

of his *Speculum doctrinale*; this was probably made by some still unidentified translator around 1300 in the circle of the Dominicans of Pera (Sternbach 1900–1901; W. Aerts 1986; Pérez Martín 1997b). Granted that Scholarios was in contact with the Dominicans of Pera (see *infra*, p. 160, n. 176), it is plausible to assume that he had access to Vincent's or Peraldus' writings. Still, if there is any direct evidence connecting Scholarios' utilization of II^a II^{ae} with Peraldus (via Vincent or not), it has escaped me.

²³ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 91, 33–92, 4.

²⁴ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 91r (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 100, 1). Cf. Basil of Caesarea's *Asketicon magnum* 3 ("Περὶ τῆς εἰς τὸν πλησίον ἀγάπης"): "...Ημερον καὶ κοινωνικὸν ζῆσον ὁ ἀνθρωπος, καὶ οὐχὶ μοναστικὸν οὐδὲ ἄγριον... Οὐδὲν γάρ οὕτως ἴδιον τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν ὡς τὸ κοινωνεῖν ἀλλήλοις καὶ χρήζειν ἀλλήλων καὶ ἀγαπᾶν τὸ ὄμόφυλον" (PG 31: 917A).

²⁵ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 94r, 39 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 109, 18–19).

²⁶ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 88v, 14–15; 17–19 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 88, 30–89, 1; 89, 4–5). Cf. Gallagher 1999 *in toto*.

is by nature impossible, which means absolutely impossible; and, in the *Sed contra*, he quotes the same scriptural passage. This is how Scholarios puts this point in the abridgment of this article in his *Compendium “Primae Secundae”*:

Τέταρτον· εἰ δυνατόν τινα ἔαυτὸν μισεῖν. Ἐν γὰρ τῷ πέμπτῳ τῆς Πρὸς Ἐφεσίους φησὶν ὁ Ἀπόστολος: «Οὐδέποτε τὴν ἴδιαν σάρκα μισεῖ». ... Οὐδεὶς βούλεται ἢ ποιεῖ ἔαυτῷ κακὸν εἰμὴ κατὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.²⁷

Thomas has the same argument in II^a II^{ae}, qu. 126, art. 1 (“Εἰ τὸ ἄφοβον εῖναι ἀμαρτίᾳ ἐστίν”), which, in Scholarios’ partly abridged version of II^a II^{ae}, reads:

Ἐγκειται τοίνυν ἐκάστω φύσει τὸ τὴν ἴδιαν ἀγαπᾶν καὶ πάντα τὰ πρὸς αὐτὴν ταττόμενα, πλὴν τὸν προσήκοντα τρόπον, ὥστε δηλονότι ἀγαπᾶσθαι ταῦτα οὐχ ὡς ἐν τούτοις ὅντος τοῦ τέλους, ἀλλὰ καθό τούτοις ἔνεκα τοῦ ἑσχάτου τέλους χρῆσθαι προσήκει. Ὁθεν τὸ ἀσθενεῖν τινα περὶ τὴν κατὰ λόγον φυσικὴν τούτων ἀγάπην παρὰ τὴν φυσικὴν ἐστι ὁπῆν... Οὐ μὴν τῆς τοιαύτης ἀγάπης παντελῶς τις ἐκπίπτει τὸ γὰρ τῆς φύσεως ἀδύνατον παντελῶς ἀπολέσθαι. Ὁθεν ὁ Ἀπόστολος ἐν τῷ εἰ τῆς Πρὸς Ἐφεσίους φησὶν «οὐδεὶς τὴν ἔαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν».²⁸

The second clause of Scholarios’ passage (“ἀλλὰ ... ἔκαστος”) is a sort of comment on Mt. 22:37–39. That one should love God more than oneself is Aquinas’ point in qu. 26, art. 3 (“Εἰ [δεῖ τὸν Θεὸν ἀγαπᾶν] καὶ ἔαυτοῦ πλέον”), *Sed contra* and *Resp.*: “Μᾶλλον ἄρα τὸν Θεὸν ἢ ἔαυτὸν ἀγαπᾶν ὀφείλει ὁ ἀνθρωπος. ... Ὁθεν ὁ ἀνθρωπος μᾶλλον δι’ ἀγάπης ὀφείλει τὸν Θεὸν ἀγαπᾶν, ὃς ἐστι κοινὸν πάντων ἀγαθόν, ἢ ἔαυτόν”.²⁹ In the *Resp.*, we can also find the main point of Scholarios’ introductory remark on the innately social character of every human being. Since there is no verbal connection here to Scholarios’ lines, I quote it in translation:

The fellowship of natural goods bestowed on us by God is the foundation of natural love, in virtue of which not only man, so long as his nature remains unimpaired, loves God above all things and more than himself, but also every single creature, each in its own way, i. e. either by an intellectual, or by a rational, or by an animal, or at least by a natural love, as stones do, for instance, and other things bereft of knowledge, because each part naturally loves the common good of the whole more than its own particular good. This is evidenced by its operation, since the principal inclination of each part is towards common action conducive to the good of the whole. It may also be seen in civic virtues whereby sometimes the citizens suffer damage even to their own property and persons for the sake of the common good. Wherefore much more is this realized with regard to the friendship of charity which is based on the fellowship of the gifts of grace.³⁰

²⁷ Eds. Jugie et al., tome VI, 33, 34–34, 1.

²⁸ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 266r, 23–29.

²⁹ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 93r, 17–18; 32–33 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 105, 3–4; 105, 19–21).

³⁰ Translation by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province 2007, 1290–1291. This looks like a paraphrase and development of Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite’s *De divinis nominibus* IV, 15 (ed. B.-R. Suchla, *Corpus dionysiacum. I: Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De divinis nominibus* [Patristische Texte und Studien 33], Berlin and New York 1990, 161, 1–5).

As for the last clause, this is *grosso modo* Aquinas' point in qu. 26, art. 4 ("Εἰ [δεῖ ἀγαπᾶν] ἔαυτὸν πλέον ἢ τὸν πλησίον") and 5 ("Εἰ [δεῖ ἀγαπᾶν] τὸν πλησίον πλέον ἢ τὸ ἕδιον σῶμα").³¹ In art. 4, Thomas, quoting in the *Sed contra* Mt. 22:39 ("ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν"), argues that one should not love the others' salvation more than one's own, which, nevertheless, he implies, is possible with regard to bodily goods (except for the fundamental good of the body, which is life itself).

Scholarios (par. 2) goes on by verbosely repeating that fasting without charity is detestable to God and that it is only thanks to His mercy that He tolerates our merciless indifference to our brethren and His children.³² What God demands of us more than anything else is love:

Ταύτης [sc. τῆς ἀγάπης] εἰς δύο μεριζομένης, εἴς τε τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ πλησίον, ἢ τοῦ πλησίον μείζων ἐστίν. Αὕτη γὰρ καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸν Θεόν ἀγάπην προϋποτίθησιν· ὁ γὰρ τὸν πλησίον ἀγαπῶν νόμον καὶ ἐντολὴν πληροῖ τοῦ Θεοῦ, «ὁ δὲ τὰς ἐντολὰς τηρῶν» τοῦ Θεοῦ «τὸν Θεόν ἀγαπᾷ» (Joh. 14:15).³³

This is an adaptation of qu. 27, art. 8 ("Πότερον βέλτιον ἀγαπᾶν τὸν Θεόν ἢ τὸν πλησίον"), Resp.:

...Ἡ τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπη περιλαμβάνει ἐν ἔαυτῇ καὶ τὴν θείαν ἀγάπην, ἡ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγάπη οὐ περιέχει τὴν τοῦ πλησίον. ... «Ταύτην γὰρ ἔχομεν τὴν ἐντολὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα ὁ τὸν Θεόν ἀγαπῶν ἀγαπᾷ καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ» (I Joh. 4:21). Καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο τὸν νοῦν ἡ τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπη ὑπερέχει τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ.³⁴

In par. 3, Scholarios argues that the innovative element of the New Testament in comparison to the Old was the preaching of love, which supersedes that of justice. He enriches this argument by saying that almsgiving, taken as an expression of love, "μέρος τῆς καθόλου δικαιοσύνης ἐστὶ μέγα καὶ τῆς εἰδικῆς λεγομένης προσθήκη καὶ ὑπερβολή".³⁵ This sounds like scholastic terminology, and indeed, in qu. 79, art. 1 ("Περὶ τῶν δύο εἰδικῶν μερῶν τῆς δικαιοσύνης"), one reads:

...Ἡ δικαιοσύνη, καθόσον ἐστὶν εἰδικὴ ἀρετή, ὅρᾳ τάγαθὸν κατὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ τῷ πλησίον ὄφει λομένου. Καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο τῆς εἰδικῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐστὶ ποιεῖν τάγαθὸν κατὰ τὸν τοῦ ὄφειλομένου λόγον ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον παραθέσει...³⁶

³¹ Cod. *Par. gr.* 1237, fol. 93v, 9–94v, 3 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 106, 9–109, 22).

³² Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 92, 4–93, 15.

³³ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 93, 15–19.

³⁴ Cod. *Par. gr.* 1237, fol. 104r, 24–29 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 144, 15–21). See also qu. 44, art. 2 («Εἰ [αἱ ἐντολαὶ τῆς ἀγάπης] ἐν ἡ δύο μόναι»,) Resp: «...ῶν ἀτέρα τάττεται ὑπὸ τὴν λοιπήν» (cod. *Par. gr.* 1237, fol. 155r, 10–11; cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 131, 14–15).

³⁵ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 93, 28–29.

³⁶ Cod. *Par. gr.* 1237, fol. 231r, 15–17 (cf. ed. Kalokairinou 2002, 295, 15–18).

Likewise, in I^a Pars, qu. 21, art. 3 ad 2^{um}, Thomas argues that “ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη οὐκ ἀναιρεῖ τὴν δικαιοσύνην, ἀλλ’ ἔστιν ὥσπερ τις δικαιοσύνης ὑπερβολή”.³⁷

2.2 The main part of the *Sermon*

The main part of the *Sermon*, which is full of Thomistic material, begins with par. 4: “...Περὶ ἐλεημοσύνης νῦν λέγομεν. Αὕτη τοίνυν ἀγάπης ἔστιν ἀποτέλεσμα προσεχές, τῆς κορυφαίας τῶν ἀρετῶν”.³⁸ This is a paraphrase of the very title of qu. 32: “Περὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν τῆς ἀγάπης ἀποτελεσμάτων ἡ ἐνεργειῶν”³⁹ (cf. qu. 32, art. 1, Resp.: “Τὸ διδόναι ἐλεημοσύνην ἐνέργειά ἔστιν ἀγάπης”⁴⁰). That love is the highest of virtues is shown in the first of the *quaestiones* on love: “Εἴ ἔστιν ὑψηλοτάτη τῶν ἀρετῶν” (qu. 23, art. 6).⁴¹

Scholarios alerts his audience to the fact that sometimes an act of charity is hypocritical and therefore, contrary to appearances, vicious, as its motive is “φόβος” or “ἐλπίς μείζονος ἀγαθοῦ” or, in the best case, one simply acts “κατὰ λόγον φυσικῆς ἐλευθεριότητος”.⁴² This derives directly from Thomas' qu. 32, art. 1 ad 1^{um}: “Πολλοὶ γὰρ μὴ ἔχοντες ἔξιν δικαιοσύνης [sc. the true virtue of justice] ποιοῦσι δίκαια ἡ διὰ τὸν φυσικὸν λόγον ἡ διὰ φόβου ἡ ἐλπίδα τοῦ τυχεῖν τυνος”.⁴³ To Scholarios, one must pursue “formal [metaphysically speaking] charity” (“...τὸ εἶδος καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν”⁴⁴). This is exactly Thomas' distinction between practising charity “ὑλικῶς” (*materialiter*) and practising charity “εἰδικῶς” (*formaliter*), the former being possible for one to pursue even without love.⁴⁵ To Scholarios, proper charity is “ἡ διὰ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ δι’ οὐδὲν ἄλλο πρόσκαιρον καὶ προθύμως καὶ ἡδέως καὶ ἱλαρῶς καὶ κατὰ πάντα τὸν πρέποντα γινομένη τρόπον”.⁴⁶ Again, this is a direct borrowing from the ad 1^{um}: “...προθύμως καὶ ἡδέως. ...Διὰ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ προθύμως καὶ ἡδέως καὶ πάντα τὸν προσήκοντα τρόπον”.⁴⁷

³⁷ I quote from cod. *Vatop.* 255, fol. 99v, 12–14, which was in Scholarios' possession from 1431/32 (see *infra*, pp. 151–152). See also Scholarios' *Compendium “Summae contra Gentiles” et Iae Partis “Summae theologiae”*, eds. Jugie et al., tome V, 358, 22–23: “Καὶ ἔστιν ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη δικαιοσύνης ὑπερβολή”. As will be seen, Scholarios used this article from I^a Pars in par. 7, too. On almsdeeds as a crossroads of justice and charity in II^a II^ae, see Spicq 1930.

³⁸ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 93, 34–36. See also 94, 5–6: “...ἀγάπης ἔστιν ἀποτέλεσμα τῆς πρὸς Θεὸν καὶ τὸν πλησίον”; 94, 36: “...ἀγάπης μὲν ἀμέσως ἔξηρτημένην, τῆς τῶν ἀρετῶν κορυφῆς...”.

³⁹ Cod. *Par. gr.* 1237, fol. Av, 47 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 184, 1–2).

⁴⁰ Cod. *Par. gr.* 1237, fol. 114v, 3 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 186, 2).

⁴¹ Cod. *Par. gr.* 1237, fol. 73v, 31 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 37, 1–39, 2).

⁴² Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 93, 38–94, 2.

⁴³ Cod. *Par. gr.* 1237, fol. 114v, 6–8 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 186, 7–8).

⁴⁴ Cf. eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 93, 16: “εἰδοπεποιημένη ἐλεημοσύνη”.

⁴⁵ Cod. *Par. gr.* 1237, fol. 114v, 8–12 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 186, 5–14).

⁴⁶ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 93, 37–38.

⁴⁷ Cod. *Par. gr.* 1237, fol. 114v, 13–14 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 186, 11–15).

Scholarios goes on to show⁴⁸ that charity, besides being worth pursuing on its own, expiates one's sins. This is what Aquinas argues in qu. 32, art. 4 ("Εἰ αἱ σωματικαὶ ἐλεημοσύναι ἔχουσι πνευματικὸν καρπόν")⁴⁹. In his *Sed contra*, Thomas appeals to Eccles. 17:22: "...λέγεται ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Ἑκκλησιαστοῦ 'ἐλεημοσύνη ἀνδρὸς τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὡς κόρην συντηρήσει'".⁵⁰ Scholarios copied this passage almost verbatim ("ἐλεημοσύνη ἀνδρὸς τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὡς κόρην συντηρήσει") from "Thomas Graecus"⁵¹ and made a reference to the book of "Ἐκκλησιαστής" (*Ecclesiasticus*⁵²) that puzzled his editors.⁵³

In the *Resp.*, Aquinas appeals to more Scriptural passages: "...κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Ἑκκλησιαστοῦ [i. e. *Ecclesiasticus*]· ἀπόλλυε χρήματα διὰ τὸν ἀδελφόν· ἀποτίθει θησαυρὸν ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς τοῦ Ὑψίστου, καὶ συνοίσει σοι μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ χρυσίον" (Eccles. 29:11); "σύγκλεισον ἐλεημοσύνην ἐν κόλπῳ πένητος, καὶ οὗτος ἔξελεῖται σε ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ" (Eccles. 29:12).⁵⁴ This is what Scholarios does as well: "...ἔκεινο τοῦ Ἑκκλησιαστοῦ...· ἀπόλλυε", φησί, 'χρήματα διὰ τὸν ἀδελφόν· ἀποτίθει θησαυρὸν ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς τοῦ Δεσπότου, καὶ συνοίσει σοι μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ χρυσίον"; "...ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Ἑκκλησιαστῇ σαφῶς λέγεται· 'σύγκλεισον', φησίν, ἐλεημοσύνην ἐνώπιον πένητος, καὶ οὗτος ἔξελεῖται σε ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ'...".⁵⁵ In the *Septuagint*, these two passages read: "Θέξ τὸν θησαυρὸν σου κατ' ἐντολὰς Ὑψίστου, καὶ λυσιτελήσει σοι μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ χρυσίον"; "Σύγκλεισον ἐλεημοσύνην ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις σου, καὶ αὕτη ἔξελεῖται σε ἀπὸ πάσης κακώσεως".

Some lines below on the same page of cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, the next article (art. 5) begins, in arg. 1 of which this Scriptural passage occurs: "...κατὰ τὸ δέ τοῦ Δανιὴλ· 'ἢ βουλή μου τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀρεσάτω· τὰς ἀμαρτίας σου ἐλεημοσύναις ἔξαλειψον'" (Dan. 4:27).⁵⁶ Aquinas had quoted this passage for a different purpose; still, it obviously showed the expiatory character of charity and thereby fitted to the context of Scholarios' argument. So, Scholarios integrated it into his own text: "...ἐν τῷ Δανιὴλ

⁴⁸ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 94, 11–13.

⁴⁹ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 116v, 22.

⁵⁰ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 116v, 36–37 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 193, 21–22). The editors arbitrarily "correct" the unanimous in the manuscripts reading "Ἐκκλησιαστοῦ" (see app. crit., ad loc.) to "Σοφίας Σειράχ" throughout. This is what they sometimes do with regard to the numbers of the Bible chapters and verses.

⁵¹ The passage in the *Septuagint* reads: "ἐλεημοσύνη ἀνδρὸς... χάριν ἀνθρώπου ὡς κόρην συντηρήσει".

⁵² The editors (see *ad loc.*) expect "Ἐκκλησιαστικός". No research into Demetrios Kydones' rendering of the Latin titles of the books of the Holy Scripture has ever been made. Cf. J.A. Demetracopoulos 2007, 319, n. 47.

⁵³ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 94, 14 *ad loc.* Cf. Jugie et al., tome VI, p. VIII–IX.

⁵⁴ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 117r, 4–6; 9–10 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 194, 2–4; 194, 8–9).

⁵⁵ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 94, 14–16; 94, 28–29.

⁵⁶ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 117r, 20–21 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 194, 22–24).

σαφῶς λέγεται· ‘ἡ βουλὴ’ γάρ ‘μου’, φησί, ‘τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀρεσάτω· τὰς ἀμαρτίας σου ἐλεημοσύναις ἔχάλειψον’.⁵⁷ Again, the passage in the *Septuagint* is quite different: “Κύριος ζῆ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ... Αὐτοῦ δεήθητι περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν σου καὶ πάσας τὰς ἀδικίας σου ἐν ἐλεημοσύναις λύτρωσαι”.

Scholarios adds further scriptural evidence for the great benefits of almsdeeds: “Αἱ δὲ Κορνηλίου ‘ἐλεημοσύναι’ πρὸς Θεὸν ‘ἀναβᾶσαι’ τὴν τῆς ἀληθοῦς πίστεως ἀποκάλυψιν ἄθλον αὐτῷ πεπόμφασιν”.⁵⁸ This reference to the episode of the Roman centurion Cornelius in Act. 10:1–33 does not occur in qu. 32. Yet, it does occur in qu. 10 (“Περὶ τῶν ἀντικειμένων παθῶν τῇ πίστει”), art. 4 (“Εἰ πᾶσα τῶν ἀπίστων ἐνέργεια ἀμαρτίᾳ ἐστίν”; *Sed contra* and ad 3^{um}), where infidelity in relation to moral acts such as charity is discussed:

...Τούναντίον λέγεται περὶ τοῦ Κορνηλίου, ὃ ἔτι ἀπίστῳ ὅντι εἴρηται τὰς ἐλεημοσύνας αὐτοῦ εὐ-προσδέκτους γενέσθαι. [...]

Περὶ δὲ τοῦ Κορνηλίου δεῖ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἀπίστος οὐκ ἦν· ἀλλως γάρ οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἡ τούτου πρᾶξις ἄνευ «πίστεως» εὐπρόσδεκτος τῷ Θεῷ, ἡς «ἄνευ» «οὐδεὶς δύναται τῷ Θεῷ ἀρέσκειν» (Rom. 8:8). Εἶχε μέντοι πίστιν συνεπτυγμένην, τῆς τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου ἀληθείας οὕπω δεδημευμένης. Ὅθεν, ἵνα τελείως αὐτὸν καταρτίσειν εἰς τὴν πίστιν, ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλεται.⁵⁹

Scholarios' reproduction of Act. 10:4 (“Αἱ προσευχαὶ σου καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου ἀνέβησαν ‘εἰς μνημόσυνον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ’ [cf. Eccles. 50:16]”)⁶⁰ is partly close to the Greek original text and partly to its version in the “Thomas Graecus”. Undoubtedly, therefore, Scholarios' source was the just quoted Thomistic passage. Scholarios does not enter into Aquinas' delicate discussion of the effects of the “fides implicita” on the moral value of one's acts; for the purpose of his sermon, it was sufficient to include a vague reference to the way in which Cornelius joined Christians. The Cornelius story is discussed sometimes in the Greek patristic literature — e. g., in John Chrysostom's *De eleemosyna, et in decem virgines*.⁶¹ Yet, Scholarios did not turn to any Greek text, but exclusively to Thomas.

In par. 5, Scholarios makes the qualification that almsgiving, in spite of its religiously imperative character, should not be pursued in an irrational, extreme way and lead social life to collapse. Rather, one should first take care of oneself, then of

⁵⁷ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 94, 18–19.

⁵⁸ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 94, 34–35.

⁵⁹ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 32r, 29–30; 32v, 11–15 (cf. ed. Leontsinis and Glycophrydi-Leontsini 1976, 158, 5–6; 159, 3–7). Scholarios was to draw on qu. 10 in his *Letter to Oises* (see J. A. Demetracopoulos 2004a, 134–135; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2006a, 334–336; cf. *infra*, p. 151, n. 127).

⁶⁰ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 94, 33–35.

⁶¹ PG 49: 291; 293. See also John Chrysostom, *De poenitentia homilia VII*, 6 (PG 49: 332); Ps.-John Chrysostom, *De jejunio et eleemosyna* (PG 48: 1060); Ps.-John Chrysostom, *De eleemosyna* (PG 60: 749–750); Gregory Nazianzen, *De pauperum amore* (PG 35: 857A–909C). On the various Greek patristic ideas on almsgiving, see, e. g., Karayiannis 1994, 56–58.

one's close and distant relatives, then of one's neighbours and so on *gradatim*.⁶² This is Thomas' point in the Resp. of art. 5, which shows that charity is imperative for Christians.⁶³ Scholarios⁶⁴ also alerts his listeners to the possible misinterpretation of Jesus' exhortation "go and sell all your belongings" (Matt. 19:21) as strictly imperative for everybody. This is what Aquinas does in qu. 32, art. 6 ("Εἰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀναγκαίου δεῖ διδόναι τὴν σωματικὴν ἐλέμησοσύνην").⁶⁵ To Scholarios, this exhortation has to do with perfection ("Εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι..."), which one can see in certain exceptional figures, such as the prophet Elisha:

'Ο γὰρ πάντα τὰ ὄντα σκορπίζων διὰ Χριστὸν ἔργον ποιεῖ τελειότητος, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ τάξει μετατιθεὶς ἔαυτόν... Ό τῷ ἐκείνου [sc. Jesus] τοίνυν ζήλῳ πάντων ὑφ' ἐν τοῖς πένησιν ἔξιστάμενος... Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τῇ Παλαιᾷ (III Reg. 19:21) τοὺς αὐτοῦ βοῦς Ἐλισσαῖος ἔσφαξε πάντας καὶ τροφὴν τοῖς πένησιν ἔδωκε, προθέμενος μηδεμιᾶ λοιπὸν φροντίδι κρατεῖσθαι, ὥσπερ προανακηρύττων τὴν τελειότητα τῶν κατὰ Χριστὸν μελλόντων φιλοσοφεῖν, τουτέστι τῶν ἀληθινῶν μοναχῶν.⁶⁶

This is a very close borrowing from qu. 32, art. 10 ad 2^{um}:

...ό Θεός οὐ βούλεται ὑφ' ἐν τὸν πλοῦτον ἐκχεῖσθαι, εἰ μήπου τις μεταμείβει τὸ σχῆμα. (...) ...«Εἰ μήπου ὕσπερ ὁ Ἐλισσαῖος (III Reg. 19:21) τοὺς ἔαυτοῦ βοῦς ἔσφαξε καὶ τοὺς πένητας ἔθρεψε προθέμενος μηδεμιᾶ λοιπὸν φροντίδι κρατεῖσθαι».⁶⁷

Even Scholarios' σκορπίζειν (a synonym for the scriptural "δός" in Matt. 19:21, Mark 10:21) and his reference to the monks as the "perfect" ones occur in qu. 32, art. 6:

...ὅταν τις τὸν βίον μεταβάλλῃ, οἶον μοναχικὸν ὑποδυόμενος βίον· τότε γὰρ πάντα τὰ ἔαυτοῦ ἀγαθὰ διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν σκορπίζων ἔργον ποιεῖ τελειότητος ἐν ἄλλῃ τάξει μετατιθεὶς ἔαυτόν.⁶⁸

Scholarios changed only "ἄλλῃ" to "ἑτέρᾳ", which is hardly much of a change to what he read in the "Thomas Graecus".

Thereafter (par. 6), Scholarios commences a discussion of the practicality of the commandment of almsgiving, mainly addressing the common objection of how the poor or average man, who obviously lack the means, are supposed to observe it. His reply runs that one's subjective intention or good will counts more than the objective extent of the help one offers, which means that even the slightest charitable contri-

⁶² Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 95, 3–22.

⁶³ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 117r, 38–v, 28 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 195, 16–196, 16).

⁶⁴ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 95, 22–96, 2.

⁶⁵ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 118r, 19 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 198, 16–199, 14).

⁶⁶ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 95, 25–35.

⁶⁷ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 121v, 5–8 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 209, 5–9). Aquinas quotes from Ambrose.

⁶⁸ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 118v, 20–23 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 199, 15–18).

bution counts on the spiritual level. In this context, he appeals to Jesus' celebrated comment on the contribution of the poor widow to the treasury (Luke 21:1–4: "...πλεῖον πάντων ἔβαλεν..."; cf. Marc. 12:41–44):

Οὐ γάρ τῇ τοῦ διδομένου ποσότητι, ἀλλὰ τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ διδόντος καὶ τῇ προθέσει προσέχειν τὸν ἡμετέρων ἔργων ἔξετασθη, δος καὶ τὴν χήραν ἐπίγνεσεν ἐκ τῶν ἀναγκαίων συνεισενεγκαμένην καὶ διὰ τοῦτο «πλέον πάντων» ἀναλόγως ἐπιβαλοῦσαν.⁶⁹

This is Aquinas' point in qu. 32, art. 4 (arg. 3 and ad 3^{um}):

...ἐν τῷ καὶ τοῦ Κατὰ Λουκᾶν λεγομένῳ περὶ τῆς χήρας..., ἥ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου ἀπόφασιν «πλέον ἔβαλε πάντων». (...) ...Ἡ χήρα ἦττον δέδωκε κατὰ τὴν ποσότητα, πλέον καὶ ἀναλογίαν.⁷⁰

Once more, Scholarios deviates from the text of the Greek New Testament because he follows "Thomas Graecus".

Scholarios then examines the rare case when one's personal property amounts to literally nothing and argues that even in such a case one is nevertheless still able to practise alms. How so? One is capable of "spiritual alms", i. e. of alms that supplies someone's spiritual needs:

...πνευματικῆς ἄλλαις στερήσεσι καὶ χρείαις ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑποβέβληται φύσις, αἵς βοηθῶν τις καὶ πολλῷ μεῖζον τὸν ἔλεον ἐπιδείκνυται, ὅσῳ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ σώματος πέφυκε τιμιώτερον...⁷¹

This distinction between "έλεημοσύνη σωματική" and "έλεημοσύνη πνευματική" derives from qu. 32, art. 2 ("Περὶ τῆς διακρίσεως τῶν ἔλεημοσυνῶν"⁷²), Resp.:

...ἡ προειρημένη τῶν ἔλεημοσυνῶν διάκρισις εἰκότως λαμβάνεται κατὰ τὰς διαφόρους τῶν πλησίον ἐνδείας. Ὡν αἱ μὲν εἰσὶ ψυχικαὶ, εἰς ᾧς τάττονται αἱ πνευματικαὶ ἔλεημοσύναι, αἱ δὲ σωματικαὶ, πρὸς ᾧς πάλιν τάττονται αἱ σωματικαὶ. Αἱ μὲν οὖν τοῦ σώματος ἐνδείαι... Ὄμοίως δὲ καὶ ταῖς πνευματικαῖς ἐνδείαις διὰ τῶν πνευματικῶν ἐνεργειῶν ἡ βοηθεία γίνεται...⁷³

Likewise, in qu. 32, art. 3 ("Πότερόν εἰσι κρείττους ἔλεημοσύναι αἱ σωματικαὶ ἢ αἱ πνευματικαί"), Thomas argues for the partial superiority of spiritual alms as follows:

⁶⁹ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 96, 5–8. The form ἐπιβαλοῦσαν, which is in the edition, is grammatically unacceptable; ἐπιβαλοῦσαν would make sense.

⁷⁰ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 116v, 33–35; 117r, 15–16 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 193, 17–19; 194, 16–17).

⁷¹ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 96, 20–26.

⁷² Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 114v, 25 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 187, 1).

⁷³ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 115r, 21–25; 37–38 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 188, 12–189, 1). Cf. qu. 31, art. 2, Resp.: "Οἱ γὰρ ἀνθρωποι πολλὰς ἐνδείας δύνανται πάσχειν" (cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 112r, 37–38; cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 178, 3).

“Τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα τιμιώτερόν ἐστι τοῦ σώματος”.⁷⁴ Scholarios, to show how one can substitute spiritual alms for a bodily, reproduces Thomas' list of the kinds of corporal charity. I italicize the words that fully coincide:

Scholarios, <i>On Almsgiving</i> , par. 6	Thomas Aquinas, <i>Summa theologiae</i> , II ^a II ^a e, qu. 32, art. 3
τροφὴν δοῦναι	τρέφειν τὸν πεινῶντα
ποτίζειν	ποτίζειν τὸν διψῶντα
ένδυειν γυμνόν	ένδύειν τὸν γυμνόν
τοῦ νοσοῦντος ἐπίσκεψις	συνάγειν τὸν ξένον
ξένον ὑποδέχεσθαι	ἐπισκέπτεσθαι τὸν ἀσθενῆ
λύτρα ορ λῦσαι σωματικῶν δεσμῶν τὸν	λυτροῦσθαι τὸν αἰχμάλωτον
αἰχμάλωτον	
κηδεῦσαι τὸν τεθνεῶτα ⁷⁵	θάπτειν τὸν τεθνηκότα ⁷⁶
	ορ
	ξηρὰ τροφή (ορ τρέφειν)
	ύγρα τροφή (ορ ποτίζειν)
	σκέπη
	ένδυειν τὸν γυμνόν
	ὑποδέχεσθαι τὸν ξένον
	τὸν ἀσθενῆ ἐπισκέπτεσθαι
	ἢ τοῦ αἰχμαλώτου λύτρωσις
	ἢ τῶν ἀποθνησκόντων ταφή ⁷⁷

In par. 7, Scholarios extols the ubiquity of the virtue of ἐλεημοσύνη (“τὴν γῆν πληροῖ πᾶσσαν”) by fundamentally ascribing it to God himself as the almighty and beneficial ruler of the universe, including human affairs. After appealing to some scriptural passages in this direction, he remarks:

Αὕτη εἴπερ τι ἄλλο τῶν ἐπὶ Θεοῦ κοινῶς λεγομένων ιδιὸν ἐστιν αὐτοῦ καὶ πρᾶγμα τῆς παντοδυνάμου μεγαλειότητος ἀξιον. «Γίνεσθε» γάρ, φησίν, «οἰκτίρμονες, ὕσπερ καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ύμῶν ὁ οὐρανίος οἰκτίρμων ἐστι» (Lc. 6:36). Καὶ εἰ μὴ πρόσεστι τῷ Θεῷ τὸ πάθος τοῦ οἴκτου, καθώς ἐστιν ὁδύνη τις καὶ λύπη ἐπὶ τῇ ταλαιπωρίᾳ τοῦ πάσχοντος, ἀλλὰ πρόσεστιν ἡ τοῦ ἐλέους ἐνέργεια, καθ’ ἥν ἐκχεῖ τοῖς δεομένοις τὰ ἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰς τῶν πασχόντων ἐνδείας ἐπικουφίζει.⁷⁸

⁷⁴ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 116r, 10; 116v, 1 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 190, 26–27; 192, 10).

⁷⁵ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 96, 26–97, 3.

⁷⁶ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 114v, 27–30 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 187, 4–6).

⁷⁷ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 115r, 21–25; 37–38 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 188, 19–28).

⁷⁸ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 97, 24–30.

Two small divergences of the scriptural quotation from the Greek original (“Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἔστι”) look suspicious. In fact, one can find the selfsame passage in qu. 30, art. 4 (“Εἴ μεγίστη τῶν ἀρετῶν ἔστιν ὁ ἔλεος”), arg. 3, where Aquinas argues that this virtue renders us imitators of God.⁷⁹ In the Resp., one can find the words of Scholarios italicized above:

Καθ’ αὐτὸν ... ὁ ἔλεος μέγιστόν ἔστιν αὐτῷ γάρ ἔστι τὸ καὶ εἰς ἄλλους ἐκχεῖν τὰ ἀγαθά, καὶ, ὁ πλέον ἔστι, τὰς τῶν ἄλλων ἐνδείας ἐπικουφίζειν. [...] Όθεν καὶ τὸ ἐλεεῖν ἴδιον λέγεται τοῦ Θεοῦ, κανὸν τούτῳ μάλιστα τὸ παντοδύναμον αὐτοῦ λέγεται δείκνυσθαι.⁸⁰

As for the way in which Scholarios resolves the problem of how God can be merciful, given that mercy entails compassion, i. e. emotional suffering over the misfortune of the recipient of mercy, he is wholly dependent on Aquinas. In qu. 30, art. 2 Resp., Scholarios read that

ἐπεὶ ὁ ἔλεος συμπάθειά ἔστιν ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ ἐτέρου ταλαιπωρίᾳ, ἐκ τούτου συμβαίνει ἐλεεῖν τινά, ἐξ οὗ συμβαίνει καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ ἐτέρου ταλαιπωρίᾳ λυπεῖσθαι.⁸¹

This is the apparent problem in regarding God as merciful. Where was a solution to be found? What betrays Scholarios is his calling divine mercy “τι τῶν ἐπὶ Θεοῦ κοινῶς λεγομένων”. This refers us to Thomas’ discussion of the “common divine names” (i. e. of the names that apply to all the persons of the Trinity) in Ia Pars, qu. 21 (“De justitia et misericordia Dei”), art. 3 (“Utrum misericordia competitat Deo”):

...Ῥητέον ἂν εἴπη τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην μάλιστα δεῖ ἀποδίδοσθαι τῷ Θεῷ, κατὰ τὸ ἀποτέλεσμα μέντοι, ἀλλ’ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πάθους διάθεσιν... «Ἐλεήμων» τις λέγεται, ὡς ἐλεεινὴν (ἥτοι ταλαιπωρον) καρδίαν ἔχων, ώσταν τῇ ἐτέρου ταλαιπωρίᾳ αὐτὸς οὕτω διατιθέμενος, ὥσπερ ὃν εἰδίᾳ ἦν αὐτοῦ ἡ ταλαιπωρία. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπεται σπουδάζειν αὐτὸν ἀπελάσαι τὴν ἐτέρου ταλαιπωρίαν ὥσπερ ἰδίαν, καὶ τοῦτ’ ἔστι τὸ ἀποτέλεσμα τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης. Τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τῇ ἐτέρου ταλαιπωρίᾳ λυπεῖσθαι οὐδαμῶς ἔστι τῷ Θεῷ προσῆκον, τὸ δὲ ταύτην ἀπελαύνεν μάλιστά ἔστιν οἰκεῖον αὐτῷ, διὰ τῆς «ταλαιπωρίας» πᾶσαν στερήσιν νοούντων ἡμῶν. Αἱ δὲ τοιαῦται στερήσεις διὰ μόνης τῆς τελείας ἀγαθότητος ἀναιροῦνται. Ο Θεός δέ ἔστιν ἡ πρώτη αἰτία τῆς ἀγαθότητος...⁸²

Thereafter, Scholarios exhorts his audience once more to almsdeeds:

⁷⁹ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 111r, 21–26 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 173, 4–6).

⁸⁰ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 111r, 31–35 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 173, 12–16).

⁸¹ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 110r, 4–6 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 168, 3–5). Cf. qu. 30, art. 1 ad 2um (eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 166, 16–17).

⁸² Cod. Vatop. 255, fol. 99r, 24–34 (see *infra*, pp. 152–154). Two decades or so later (on the date see *infra*, p. 152), Scholarios was to abridge the relevant article of the *Summa theologiae* as follows: “Οὐ τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην ἀποδίδοσθαι δεῖ τῷ Θεῷ μάλιστα..., κατὰ τὸ ἀποτέλεσμα μέντοι, οὐ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πάθους διάθεσιν. Οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ ἄλλου ταλαιπωρίᾳ λυπούμενος καὶ συναλγῶν, ἀλλ’ ὡς τῇ τελείᾳ ἀγαθότητι ἀπελαύνων καὶ ἀναιρῶν τὴν ταλαιπωρίαν, δηλονότι τὰς στερήσεις ἀπάσας” (Scholarios, *Compendium “Summae contra Gentiles” et Iae Partis “Summae theologiae”*, eds. Jugie et al., tome V, 358, 13–17).

Ταύτην τοίνυν τιμητέον καὶ ἀσπαστέον, ὅση δύναμις, καὶ πρὸ τῶν «θυσιῶν» αὐτὴν Θεῷ προσακτέον, «ἔλεον θέλοντι καὶ μὴ θυσίαν» (Os. 6:6; Mt. 9:13; 12:17) καὶ «εὔποιίαις» μᾶλλον ἢ «θυσίαις» ἄλλαις «ἀρεσκομένῳ» κατὰ τὸν θεῖον αὐθις Ἀπόστολον (Hebr. 13:16).⁸³

This is a direct borrowing from qu. 30, art. 4 ad 3^{um}:

...Ο ἔλεος, δι' <οὗ> ταῖς τῶν ἄλλων ἐνδείαις βοήθεια γίνεται, ἔστι θυσία τῷ Θεῷ μᾶλλον εὐπρόσδεκτος..., κατὰ τὸ ἔσχατον τῆς Πρὸς Ἐβραίους: «τῆς δὲ εὐποιίας καὶ <κοινωνίας> μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε· τοιαύταις γάρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ Θεός».⁸⁴

The scriptural passage is identical with its original Greek form; still, this is not due to Scholarios, but to Demetrios Kydones, who rendered it in this way (presumably because he remembered it accurately and realized that its version in Aquinas could be rendered back to Greek literally without altering this version).

Scholarios goes on (par. 8) to specify the order in which we should practise charity towards people: “οἱ γεννήσαντες” or “γονεῖς”, “τέκνα”, “οἱ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ τοῖς κοινοῖς ὡφέλιμοι”, “οἱ κατὰ σάρκα συνημμένοι ἡμῖν” (i. e. the remaining relatives), “τῶν λοιπῶν συγγενῶν οἱ κοινωφελέστεροι”, and “οἱ ἔξωθεν” (i. e. the non-relatives) –with “οἱ προεστῶτες ἡμῶν” having priority over “οἱ ὑφ’ ἡμῶν ἀρχόμενοι”, and, out of the latter group, the “οἵς ὀφείλομέν τινα χάριν” having priority over the “οἵς οὐκ ὀφείλομεν”.⁸⁵ All this is a succinct yet verbally very close summary of Aquinas’ qu. 31 (“Περὶ εὐποιίας”), art. 2 (“Εἰ δεῖ πάντας εῦ ποιεῖν”) and 3 (“Εἰ τοὺς μᾶλλον συνημμένους μᾶλλον εῦ ποιεῖν δεῖ”)⁸⁶ and qu. 32, art. 6 (“Εἰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀναγκαίου δεῖ διδόναι τὴν σωματικὴν ἐλεημοσύνην”).⁸⁷ For brevity’s sake, I will not offer a detailed comparison, but only point out, for instance, Scholarios’ “αὐτὸὺς [sc. τοὺς γεννήσαντας] δεῖ προτιμᾶσθαι πάντων πρὸς ἔλεος”⁸⁸ and Thomas’ “τοὺς γονέας ἐν ταῖς τῶν εὐποιῶν ἀντιμετρήσει πάντων δεῖ προτιμᾶν”.⁸⁹ Moreover, as usual, Scholarios borrows *verbatim* (from Aquinas’ qu. 31⁹⁰) some items of scriptural evidence: “...ὑποδέξονται ἡμᾶς εἰς τὰς αἰώνιους μονάς” (Luke 16:9: “...δέξωνται ἡμᾶς εἰς τὰς αἰώνιους σκηνάς”); “Τὰ σπλάγχνα τῶν ἀγίων ἀναπέπαυται διὰ σοῦ, ἀδελφέ” (Philem.

⁸³ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 97, 31–33.

⁸⁴ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 111v, 8–12. “Οὗ” and “κοινωνίας” do not figure in the codex (see eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 173, 29–174, 4). As expected, they do not figure in Scholarios’ passage either.

⁸⁵ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 97, 34–98, 16.

⁸⁶ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 112r, 23–113v, 16 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 177, 11–182, 5).

⁸⁷ Eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and M. Brentanou 1980, 198, 21–199, 14. Cf. *supra*, p. 140.

⁸⁸ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 97, 37–98, 1.

⁸⁹ Qu. 31, art. 3 ad 3^{um} (cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 113v, 6–7; cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 181, 22–23).

⁹⁰ Qu. 32, art. 3, arg. 3; art. 6, arg. 3; art. 9, arg. 2 (cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 116r, 26–27; 118r, 31–32; 120v, 20–21; cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 191, 17–18; 198, 10–12; 206, 4–8).

7; no differences from the Greek New Testament are discernible);⁹¹ “Εἴ τις τῶν ἰδίων καὶ μάλιστα τῶν οἰκείων μὴ προνοεῖται, τὴν πίστιν ἥρνηται καὶ ἐστιν ἀπίστου χείρων” (I Tim. 5:8: “Εἴ τις τῶν ἰδίων καὶ μάλιστα οἰκείων οὐ προνοεῖται, οὗτος τὴν πίστιν ἥρνηται καὶ ἐστιν ἀπίστου χείρων”). These passages do not differ significantly from their Greek New Testament form; though, one cannot overlook the fact that they are quoted as a set by Thomas as well, and Demetrios Kydones translated them literally, as usual,⁹² from Thomas' Latin into Greek. The very fact that Scholarios quoted these particular scriptural passages in this context means that their presence in Scholarios' *Sermon* can be accounted for in terms of his reading and exploiting not the Bible but Aquinas, whereas the form in which he eventually quoted was co-shaped by his own lifelong acquaintance with the Greek Bible, which was independent of his (also lifelong) study of Aquinas' writings.⁹³

Scholarios ends this point by suggesting that, although one should normally attend to the above order in doing good, it may nevertheless happen that, in extremely pressing circumstances which this or that person may encounter, one should act differently:

Καὶ καθόλου μὲν τοιούτῳ τινὶ κανόνι πρὸς τὴν εὐποίαν χρηστέον. Ἔστι δ' ὅτε καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγκην μόνην ἀποβλεπτέον· φὰρ ἀπλῶς ἔλαττον τῶν ἄλλων ὁφείλομεν βοηθεῖν, τούτῳ συμπτώματός τινος ἐπελθόντος δεῖ τὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἄχθος ἐπικουφίζειν...⁹⁴

By mentioning “εὐποία”, Scholarios indirectly informs us that his particular source was not qu. 32, but qu. 31. Indeed, this is a close paraphrase of the concluding paragraph of qu. 31, art. 3 Resp.:

Κατὰ τὰς διαφόρους τοίνυν κοινωνίας διαφόρως τὰς διαφόρους εὐποίας δεῖ διανέμειν. (...) Δύναται μέντοι τοῦτο πολλάκις καὶ ἐναλλάττεσθαι... ἐν τινὶ φὰρ συμπτώματι μᾶλλον δεῖ βοηθῆσαι τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ, οἷον εἶτε εἴη ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἀνάγκαις, ἢ τῷ πατρὶ μὴ ἐν τῇ ὄμοιᾳ ἀνάγκῃ ὄντι.⁹⁵

At this point (par. 9), Scholarios turns again (cf. *supra*, pp. 131–142) to qu. 32, focusing on the next article, i. e. the 7th one (“Εἴ δεῖ [alms] δίδοσθαι καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀδίκως πεπορισμένων”⁹⁶):

⁹¹ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 98, 5–10.

⁹² See, e. g., J. A. Demetracopoulos 2004a, 172–173, n. 503 and 504.

⁹³ One cannot exclude out of hand the possibility that, in some cases, he opened the Greek Bible before quoting, whereas at other cases he did not. Further pressing the point without lapsing into mere speculation would require an exhaustive list of the scriptural passages in Scholarios and his sources and a comparative study of every single case. This would require a re-edition of Scholarios' writings.

⁹⁴ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 98, 17–20.

⁹⁵ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 113r, 8–14 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 180, 8–14).

⁹⁶ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 118v, 30 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 199, 26).

Ἐκλεκτέον δὲ ἐκ τῶν δικαίως πεπορισμένων, οὐκ ἔξ ὧν ἀρπάζοντες ἀδικοῦμεν. Οὐ γάρ «μαμωνᾶν ἀδικίας» (Luke 16:9) τὰ ἡδικημένα βούλεται καλεῖν ὁ Δεσπότης..., ἀλλὰ «μαμωνᾶν ἀδικίας», τουτέστιν ἀνισότητος, πάντα λέγει τὸν πλοῦτον, κάν ἐκ δικαίων ἢ πεπορισμένος προφάσεων. Οὐ γάρ ἐπίσης πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ὁ πλοῦτος διανενέμηται, τοῦ μὲν δεομένου τῶν ἀναγκαίων, τοῦ δὲ μετρίως εὐποροῦντος, τοῦ δὲ τῷ πλήθει διαρρηγνυμένου. Ἀδικος δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ὁ πλοῦτός ἐστιν, ὅτι ποικίλοις ἄχθεσι καὶ φροντίσι τὰς ἡμετέρας διανοίας βαρύνει...⁹⁷

Scholarios' gloss on “ἀδικία”, i. e. “ἀνισότης”, sounds like the Latin “iniquitas”. Indeed, the opening argument of article 7 includes Scholarios' Scriptural passage as well as the very word *iniquitas/ἀνισότης*.⁹⁸ As for the rest, one must have a look at the Resp. and the ad 1^{um}:

...Οὐ καλῶς τι πορίζεται... ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρπαγῆς καὶ τῆς κλοπῆς καὶ τῶν τόκων· ἐκ γάρ τῶν τοιούτων ἀδύνατον γίνεσθαι ἐλέμησούνην... ...Πάντα τὰ χρήματα «μαμωνᾶς ἀδικίας» λέγεται... "Ἡ «Ἄδικον» εἴρηκε «μαμωνᾶν», ὅτι ποικίλ[λ]οις ἄχθεσι πλούτου τὰς ἡμετέρας καρδίας βαρύνει... "Ἡ πάντα τὰ χρήματα «ἀδικίας» λέγονται, τουτέστιν ἀνισότητος, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐπίσης διανέμεσθαι πᾶσιν, τοῦ μὲν δεομένου, τοῦ δὲ τῷ πλήθει διαρρηγνυμένου.⁹⁹

2.2.1 Scholarios' Thomas-based excursus on usury

Thereafter, Scholarios, presumably motivated by “τόκος” in the just quoted passage from Aquinas, goes on to insert in his *Sermon* some essential material on usury from Aquinas' corresponding *quaestio*.¹⁰⁰ This is Scholarios' brief excursus at this point:

- (1) Οὐ μὴν οὐδ' ἐκ τόκων ποιητέον τὴν εὐποιίαν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν δικαίων μόνον καρπῶν ἡμῶν, τουτέστιν ἔξ ὧν ποιοῦντες αὐτοὶ καὶ κινδυνεύοντες κτώμεθα.
- (2) Χρημάτων δὲ τόκους μάλιστα μὲν οὐδὲ λαμβάνειν χρή, συναρπαγέντας δέ ποτε χρημάτων ἐπιθυμίᾳ αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἡδικημένοις ἀποδίδονται δεῖ καὶ οὕτω τὴν θείαν ἐπισπάσθαι φιλανθρωπίαν, καθάπερ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀπλῶς τῶν ἀδίκων πεπορισμένων¹⁰¹ τοῦτο πρέπον ἐστὶ ποιεῖν.
- (3) Ὄτι δὲ χαλεπὸν ἀμάρτημά ἐστιν ὑπὲρ τῶν δανείων τόκους εἰσπράττεσθαι, πρῶτον μὲν αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἀποφαίνεται· «εἰ» γάρ «δανείσεις», φησίν, «ἀργύριον τῷ λαῷ μου τῷ πτωχῷ τῷ μετὰ σοῦ κατοικοῦντι, οὐκ ἀναγκάσεις ὕσπερ εἰσπράκτωρ οὔτε τόκοις αὐτὸν πιέσεις» (Ex. 22:25).
- (4) Εἴτη τῷ λόγῳ δὴ τοῦτο δείκνυται. Ἐκείνων γάρ δυνάμεθα μόνον τόκους λαμβάνειν, ὧν τὴν χρῆσιν ἐτέροις μόνην διδόαμεν, ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς τὴν δεσποτείαν παραφυλάττοντες. Ταῦτα δέ εἰσιν,

⁹⁷ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 98, 21–32.

⁹⁸ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 118v, 33 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 200, 1–2).

⁹⁹ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 119r, 14–17; 119r, 34–v, 3 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 200, 26–202, 5). Aquinas quotes from Augustine, Ambrose and Basil. Cf. *infra*, p. 140, note 67.

¹⁰⁰ On Aquinas' view of usury, see, *inter alia*, Taeusch 1942, 296–297; Noonan 1957, 51–57; 109–111; 117–118; 143–145; Noonan 1965, 216–222; Franks 2008, 637–643.

¹⁰¹ The edition reads πεπριαιμένων, which is a non-existent verb form. Πεπορισμένων occurs in the passage from Kydones' translation that underlies Scholarios' lines (see below) as well as elsewhere in Scholarios' text itself (eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 98, 11).

ῶν ἡ χρῆσις τῆς δεσποτείας κεχώρισται, τουτέστιν οἵ δυνατόν ἔστι χρῆσθαι μὴ ἀναλισκομένοις, οἰκίᾳ δηλονότι τυχὸν ἢ ἀγρῷ ἢ τινι τῶν τοιούτων. Χρημάτων δὲ ἡ χρῆσις τῇ δεσποτείᾳ συνήπται οὐδὲ δυνατόν ἐστι χρήσασθαι τούτοις τινὰ μὴ φθείραντα τε καὶ ἀναλώσαντα. Ὁστε ὁ τούτων ἔνεκα τόκους λαμβάνων δις τὸ αὐτὸ πωλεῖ ἢ πωλεῖ τὸ μὴ ὄντα λαμβάνει γὰρ τιμὴν τῆς χρήσεως πράγματος, οὗ προηγουμένως μὲν τὴν δεσποτείαν, εἴτα σὺν αὐτῇ καὶ τὴν χρῆσιν δέδωκεν, καὶ οὐδέτερον τῶν δύο τούτων παρεφύλαξεν ἑαυτῷ.¹⁰²

As seen above (p. 145), (1) derives directly from II^a II^{ae}, qu. 32 (“Περὶ ἀλεημοσύνης”), art. 7 (“Εἰ δεῖ δίδοσθαι καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀδίκως πεπορισμένων”). Once more, Scholarios did not utilize any of the Greek Patristic or Byzantine sermons or treatises on usury, e. g., the *Contra usurarios* by Gregory of Nyssa,¹⁰³ Basil of Caesarea’s *Homilia in partem Psalmi XIV, et contra foeneratores*,¹⁰⁴ to which Gregory refers his reader in the prologue to and epilogue of his own sermon,¹⁰⁵ or the *Ὥμιλία περὶ δανείου* of Patriarch Kallistos I (rather poor, as is the case with all of the homilies of this author),¹⁰⁶ or Nicholas Kabasilas’ *Κατὰ τοκιζόντων*¹⁰⁷ and *Τῇ εὐσεβεστάτῃ Αὐγούστῃ, περὶ τόκου*.¹⁰⁸

(2) derives directly from II^a II^{ae}, qu. 78 (“Περὶ τόκου”), art. 1 (“Εἴ ἔστιν ἀμάρτημα τὸ λαμβάνειν τόκον”), Resp.:

...Τὸ λαμβάνειν ὑπὲρ ἀργυρίου δανεισθέντος ἀργύριον ἀδικόν ἔστι καθ’ ἑαυτό...Καθ’ αὐτὸ ἀμάρτημα εἰδικόν ἔστιν ὑπὲρ τῶν δανεισθέντων χρημάτων τίμημα λαμβάνειν, ὃ λέγεται «τόκος». Καὶ ὥσπερ πάντα τὰ ἀδίκως πεπορισμένα ὄφειλει τοῖς ἡδικημένοις ἀποδιδόναι ὃ ἄνθρωπος,¹⁰⁹ οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὰ χρήματα, ἀπερ εἴληφεν ὑπὲρ τόκου, ὄφειλει ἀποδιδόναι.¹¹⁰

(3) is supposed to justify what is stated in (2) by means of an argument from the “word of God”. What infallibly betrays Scholarios’ source is that, even if God did not utter His command in Greek, Scholarios’ biblical quotation varies significantly from the Septuagint text (“Εὰν δὲ ἀργύριον ἐκδανείσῃς τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου τῷ πενιχρῷ παρὰ σοι, οὐκ ἔσῃ αὐτῷ κατεπείγων, οὐκ ἐπιθήσεις αὐτῷ τόκον”) and fully coincides with Aquinas’ quotation (in the *Sed contra*) in Kydones’ translation: “...ἐν τῷ καὶ τῇ Ἐξόδῳ

¹⁰² Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 98, 32–99, 2.

¹⁰³ Ed. Gebhardt 1967, 193–207. Cf. Karayiannis 1994, 48–49.

¹⁰⁴ PG 29, 264D–280C.

¹⁰⁵ Ed. Gebhardt, *op. cit.*, 195, 20–23; 207, 4–7.

¹⁰⁶ Ed. Paidas 2013, 1257–1261. See also Gones 1980, 239–240.

¹⁰⁷ PG 150: 727–749. Cf. Baloglu 1996, 206–208.

¹⁰⁸ Eds. Congourdeau and Delouis 2010, 225–233. Cf. Joseph Bryennios, *Κεφάλαια ἐπτάκις ἐπτά* 49 (“Οτι ἀνάγκαιοτέρα τῶν ἀρετῶν ἡ ἀλεημοσύνη”) (ed. E. Boulgaris, *Ιωσήφ μοναχοῦ τοῦ Βρυεννίου τὰ εὑρεθέντα*. Vol. III: *Τὰ παραλειπόμενα*, Leipzig 1784, p. 124; reprinted by E. Deledemos, Thessaloniki 1991, pp. 132–134). In general, Aquinas’ discussion of usury is incomparably richer than any known patristic or Byzantine text.

¹⁰⁹ Regarding this point, Peraldus, who argued against owning ill-gotten goods, must have been among Thomas’ sources (see Corbett 2015, 391–392).

¹¹⁰ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 230v, 6; 24–27 (cf. ed. Kalokairinou 2002, 281, 24–25; 282, 24–283, 2).

λέγεται· ‘Εί δανείσεις ἀργύριον τῷ λαῷ μου τῷ πτωχῷ τῷ μετὰ σοῦ κατοικοῦντι, οὐκ ἀναγκάσεις ὥσπερ εἰσπράκτωρ, οὔτε τόκοις αὐτὸν πιέσεις’”.¹¹¹

(4) is supposed to justify what was stated in (2) by means of arguments based on reason. In this direction, Scholarios produces a close abridgment of Aquinas' argument in the *Resp.* of qu. 78, art. 1:

Πωλεῖται γάρ ὅπερ οὐκ ἔστι πωληθῆναι... Οὗ πρὸς δήλωσιν δεῖ θεωρεῖν ὡς εἰσὶ τινα τῶν πραγμάτων ὡν τὴν χρῆσιν ἀδύνατον γενέσθαι μὴ πρότερον αὐτῶν ἀναλαθέντων ὥσπερ οὖν φήσι τὸν ἀδύνατον ἄλλως χρήσασθαι μὴ πρότερον αὐτὰ ἀναλώσαντας. Ὅθεν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις οὐ δεῖ διαιρεῖν ιδίᾳ ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος τὴν χρῆσιν αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ νομίζειν ὃ ἂν τὴν τοῦ πράγματος συγχωρήσωμεν χρῆσιν, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα αὐτὸν συγχωρεῖν. Ὅθεν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις μετὰ τοῦ δανείου μετατίθεται καὶ η δεσποτεία τοῦ πράγματος. Εἰ δέ τις βουλόιτο ιδίᾳ μὲν τὸν οἶνον πωλεῖν, ιδίᾳ δὲ τὴν χρῆσιν τοῦ οἴνου, δις ἂν τὸ αὐτὸν ἀποδοῖτο¹¹² ἢ πωλήσειε τὸ μὴ ὄν: ὅθεν φανερῶς ἂν ἀμαρτάνοι ἀλισκόμενος ἀδικίας. (...) Εἰσὶ δέ τινα ὡν ἡ χρῆσις οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτὸν τὸ πρᾶγμα· ὥσπερ τῆς οἰκίας χρῆσις ἔστιν αὐτῇ ἡ ἐνοίκησις, οὐ μὴν ἡ κατατριβή. Ὅθεν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις δυνατὸν ἐκάτερον ιδίᾳ διδόναι τιν... Ὅθεν δικαίως δύναται τις τίμημα λαμβάνειν ὑπέρ τῆς χρήσεως τῆς οἰκίας: δ δῆλον ἐπὶ τῶν ἐνοικίων καὶ ἐμφυτεύσεων.¹¹³

Scholarios' reproduction of qu. 78 in cod. *Par. gr. 1237* does not include the *argumenta* and their refutation, whereas even the *Resp.* is in some places abridged. Still, the abridged form of the *quaestio* can fully account for Scholarios' discussion of usury in the passage from the *Sermon on Almsgiving* quoted above (pp. 146–147).

In par. 10, Scholarios argues that almsdeeds is a divine commandment because Christ himself said that he who does not do almsgiving will be punished eternally to hell:

Τὸ [...] ἀναγκαῖον τῆς πρὸς αὐτὴν [sc. ἐλεημοσύνη] ἐντολῆς ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγων λαμβάνεται. [...] Τοῖς μὲν ἡλεικόσιν ἄθλον τὴν τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείαν δίδωσιν ὑπερφυὲς ἀσυγκρίτως, τοῖς δ' ἀνηλεῶς πρὸς τὸν πλησίον διατεθεῖσι τὰς ἐν ἄδου τάττει ποινάς.¹¹⁴

This is a clear reference to Matt. 25:31–46, which, as will be seen, was the basis of Thomas' list of the various kinds of “corporal alms”. Still, this is exactly Aquinas' argument for the imperative character of almsdeeds in qu. 32, art. 5 (“Εἰ τὸ διδόναι ἐλεημοσύνην ἐντολὴ ἔστι”), *Sed contra*:

¹¹¹ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 230v, 4–6 (cf. ed. Kalokairinou, *op. cit.*, 281, 21–23).

¹¹² Apparently, Demetrios Kydones read “redderet” (instead of “venderet”), either by mistake or because this was what the Latin manuscript he was translating from actually read.

¹¹³ Cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, fol. 230v, 7–21 (cf. ed. Kalokairinou 2002, 281, 25–282, 19).

¹¹⁴ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 99, 13–18.

...Ούδεις αἰωνίᾳ κολάσει τιμωρηθήσεται παραλιπών τι, ὁ μή ἔστιν ἐντολή. Κολάζονται δέ τινες αἰωνίᾳ κατακρίσει μὴ ἐλεήσαντες, ὡς λέγεται ἐν τῷ κε' τοῦ *Κατὰ Ματθαῖον*. Τὸ διδόναι ἄρα ἐλεημοσύνην ἐντολή ἔστιν.¹¹⁵

Scholarios enriches the argument stylistically with words from the relevant scriptural passage. In the same paragraph, one meets with the Basilian passage quoted earlier (p. 130).¹¹⁶

In par. 11, Scholarios extensively repeats something from par. 1,¹¹⁷ enriching it with some didactic metaphors. In the end of par. 11, he appeals to the *auctoritas* of Basil of Caesarea again: “...Ο τὰ ἐτέρων λαμβάνων καὶ ἐτέροις διδοὺς οὐκ ἡλέησεν, ἀλλ’ ἥδικησε τὴν ἐσχάτην ἀδικίαν”, ὁ μέγας ἔφη Βασίλειος”.¹¹⁸ What is this? For sure, this is not a quotation from any of the writings of the Greek Basilian corpus. Most probably, this is a free rendering of an unidentified Basilian (or pseudo-Basilian) passage quoted in II^a II^{aε}, qu. 32, art. 7 ad 1^{um} (where, as we have seen, Thomas quotes from two Latin Patristic authorities, too): “Καὶ τῶν πολλῶν ἐκείνων τῶν πρὸ σοῦ ταῦτα κτησαμένων, ὃν διάδοχος ἐν ταῖς κληρονομίαις κατέστης, εὐρεθείη ἂν τις ἀδίκως ἀφελόμενος τὰ ἀλλότρια, εἰ καὶ σὺ ἀγνοεῖς”, ὡς φησιν ὁ Βασίλειος”.¹¹⁹ In par. 9 (see *supra*, p. 146), Scholarios had silently reproduced the content of the two Latin *auctoritates*; now, he approximates the content of the third and last, the Greek one. Scholarios' point is that giving alms out of ill-gotten possessions is unjust. Basil's point according to Thomas is that giving alms from a large inheritance is not just, if the property was acquired in an unjust way.

Par. 12 is the epilogue of the *Sermon*. Its content is simply a selective reproduction of some of the main points of the sermon, concluding with the scriptural passage with which it began (Is. 58:5).

¹¹⁵ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 117r, 35–38 (cf. eds. Ph. A. Demetracopoulos and Brentanou 1980, 195, 12–15). Passages are quoted as they stand in the manuscript.

¹¹⁶ Research into the provenance of the Thomistic version of the Basilian passage would be irrelevant here.

¹¹⁷ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 91, 33–35.

¹¹⁸ Eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 101, 5–7.

¹¹⁹ Cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 119r, 38–v, 1 (cf. ed. Kalokairinou 2002, 201, 28–202, 3). None of the *apparatus fontium* of the editions and translations of II^a II^{aε} I could stand to consult sheds light on the provenance of this quotation. The idea occurs in Ps.-Basil's *De misericordia et iudicio*: “Εἰ γὰρ ἐξ ἀδικίας καὶ ὄρπαγῆς μέλλεις προσφέρειν τῷ Θεῷ, κάλλιον μήτε κτήσασθαι τοιαύτην κτῆσιν μήτε προσφέρειν ἐξ αὐτῆς. [...] Εἰ δὲ ἀφελόμενος τὰ τῶν πενήτων πένητι δίδως, κάλλιον ἵσθα μήτε ὄρπάζων μήτε διδούς. Οὕτε γὰρ ἐξ ἀδικῶν κερδῶν εὐεργεσία πρὸς τὸν δεόμενον δεκτὴ παρὰ Θεῷ... Ἐλεημοσύνη ἐξ ἀδικίας οὐ γίνεται” (PG 31: 1708C; 1709A; 1709B; see also PG 32: 1164B–C; 1165A). This is the central topic of art. 7; still, the wording is very different.

A substantial portion of the content of the *Sermon* was reproduced by Scholarios in other writings,¹²⁰ enriched with some additional Thomistic and non-Thomistic material.

3 The manuscript evidence on Scholarios' reception of Aquinas' writings

The *Sermon on Almsgiving*, like some other Scholarian sermons, dates from Scholarios' preaching period as a layman in palace, i. e. some time (most probably during some Lent) between 1437/40 and 1447.¹²¹ That its content can, almost in its entirety, be traced back verbatim to certain *quaestiones* from Aquinas' *Summa theologiae* agrees with the fact that Scholarios' Thomism developed early on and extended both to philosophy (as suggested by his early Thomistic translations¹²²) and theology, including moral theology.¹²³ Taking into account the slavish dependence of Scholarios' *Sermon on Almsgiving* on Aquinas, it is at first piquant but, on deeper examination, illuminating, to see how Scholarios shows off his fluency in evening preaching:

Ἀπανιστάμενος γάρ ἐκ τῶν ἐν δικαιοτηρίοις θορύβων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων λειτουργιῶν καὶ τῶν οἴκοι παιδευμάτων, ἣ τοῖς ἑκάστοτε συλλεγομένοις "Ἐλλησί τε καὶ Ἰταλοῖς προύτιθέμεθα, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀσχολιῶν, ὃς αἱ τάξεις παρεῖχον, ἔτομος πρὸς τὴν τοῦ προφέρειν ἄπερ ἂν ὁ Θεὸς διδοίη χρείαν ἡρχόμην.¹²⁴

These lines had caused M. Jugie's ironic comment that "la modestie, il faut le reconnaître, ne fut jamais son [i. e. Scholarios'] fort".¹²⁵ Still, one must see where Scholarios' pride lies in this particular case. He does not say that he was able to create the content of his sermons at the very moment of delivering them; he simply says that he was "ready to pronounce them" — which most probably means that he was proud of being able, despite his many and intense activities during the day (judging, teaching etc.),

¹²⁰ Scholarios, *Περὶ τῆς πρώτης τοῦ Θεοῦ λατρείας ἢ λόγος Εὐαγγελικὸς ἐν ἐπιτομῇ* (written in 1458) 4; 9; *Περὶ διαφορᾶς τῶν συγγνωστῶν καὶ θανασίμων ἀμαρτημάτων σύντομον καὶ σαφές* 4–5 (ed. Jugie et al., *op. cit.*, tome IV, 241, 12–25; 245, 31–247, 13; 276, 31–278, 28).

¹²¹ Jugie et al., *op. cit.*, tome I, p. XLV–XLVI; tome VIII, 17*. Cf. Tinnefeld 2002a, 508.

¹²² See J. A. Demetracopoulos 2014b, 825–826. Cf. Tinnefeld 2002a, 517–518; see also *infra*, Appendix III.

¹²³ See Jugie et al. I, p. XLV; cf. Tinnefeld 2002a, 508. See also Jugie 1930a, 432: "De bonne heure il a lu la *Somme théologique*, comme on s'aperçoit en parcourant les sermons qu'il prêcha à la cour entre les années 1437 et 1448, alors qu'il était encore simple laïc. La *Somme contre les Gentils* ne lui a pas échappé non plus. Il a fait de ceux deux ouvrages ses livres de chevet, au point de ne pouvoir s'en passer jusque dans ses dernières années".

¹²⁴ Scholarios, *Θρῆνος* 6 (eds. Jugie et. al., tome I, 289, 10–14).

¹²⁵ Jugie 1939, 488.

to recall and deliver in the evening what he had memorized earlier (presumably on some previous evening). Besides, it might well be the case that the speech as actually delivered by heart was simpler and shorter than the written form that has come down to us.¹²⁶ Thus, if the circumstances of delivering these sermons are taken into account, one can easily understand why they were obviously derivative. Indeed, in light of the above findings, behind what Scholarios, quite conventionally and not at all informatively, ascribes to God's help ("ἄπερ ἀν ὁ Θεὸς διδοίη") one can discern a reference to the Christian author whom he was, not much later, to call "the witness of the Holy Spirit", namely, Thomas Aquinas.¹²⁷

In the last resort, it was Scholarios himself who said that his high intellectual stature was due to the fact that he recognized the paramount excellence of Aquinas' thought.¹²⁸

Scholarios' partly identical (qu. 1–64) and partly abridged (qu. 64–189) copy of II^a II^{aε}, which is cod. *Par. gr. 1237* (see *supra*, p. 131, n. 9), obviously antedates the *Sermon on Almsgiving*, since every single Thomistic item occurring in the *Sermon* can be traced back to this version of II^a II^{aε}, including the abridged articles. Let us try to put both this Scholarian manuscript and the *Sermon on Almsgiving* in the overall context of Scholarios' literary production as well as of his Thomism prior to becoming a monk (see *infra*, p. 158).

3.1 Scholarios' copies of *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Summa theologiae*, I^a Pars

The earliest relevant information regarding Scholarios' acquaintance with Thomas' writings concerns *Summa theologiae*, I^a Pars and the *Summa contra Gentiles*. In 1431/32, i. e. when he was around 32 and had just started producing some writings and translations,¹²⁹ Scholarios ordered a copy of I^a Pars from a certain monk called

¹²⁶ See the first-hand information that came down to us in the title of one of his homilies in a lost manuscript most probably written by Scholarios himself: "Ἐκ τῶν ὄμιλῶν, ἃς ὡμιλοῦμεν ἐν τῷ δυστυχεῖ παλατίω... Ἐγράφοντο δὲ μετὰ τὸ ἀγράφως ὄμιληθῆναι..." (Jugie et al. I, p. XXXIV–XXXV; cf. Cacourou 2010, 39*–40*).

¹²⁷ See his *Epistle to Manuel Raoul Oises* (1451/52), in which he reproduced some of the content of qu. 10, art. 11, qu. 11, art. 3 and qu. 12, art. 2 from II^a II^{aε} (see J. A. Demetracopoulos 2004a, 135; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2006a, 334). Presumably, Scholarios used cod. *Par. gr. 1237* (fol. 36v–37r, 39v–40r and 42r–v), which he had already used a few years earlier for the composition of the *Sermon* under discussion as well as some other sermons.

¹²⁸ See J. A. Demetracopoulos 2004a, 20, n. 12.

¹²⁹ See Tinnefeld's list of Scholarios' writings (2002, 493–522) as well as Blanchet's list (2008, 481–487), which revises some of the datings suggested by Jugie.

Gregorios. This is cod. *Vatop.* 255 *in toto*,¹³⁰ which includes several corrections and notes by Scholarios himself.¹³¹ In 1432, November, he acquired a copy of the entire *Summa contra Gentiles*, produced by Gregorios Bryennios, which is cod. *Taur. Gr. XXIII (C-II-16)* *in toto*.¹³² It is probable that Bryennios is the Gregorios who copied cod. *Vatop.* 255.¹³³

Probably in 1456 (see *infra*, pp. 168–169), moreover, Scholarios had access to cod. *Vatop.* 254, containing *Summa theologiae*, I^a Pars, qu. 1–43 (on the one and triune God), which at the time was included in a single codex that also contained what is now cod. *Mosqu. Syn.* 228, which includes the remaining *quaestiones* (on creation) of I^a Pars.¹³⁴

Codd. *Coisl.* 279 and 280, which date from the 15th cent., initially making up a single volume that contained the entire I^a Pars¹³⁵ on the basis of cod. *Vatop.* 254,¹³⁶ seem to have been written by Scholarios. Demetrios Kydones' translation of Aquinas' *Quaestiones quodlibetales* I, qu. 1, is contained both in cod. *Vatop.* 254, fol. 1v and in cod. *Coisl.* 279, fol. 1v. In both cases, the hand is Scholarios'.¹³⁷ Since a detailed codicological and palaographical study of these manuscripts is needed to date them, it is not as yet possible to integrate them with accuracy into the history of Scholarios' acquaintance with the "Thomas Graecus".

3.2 Scholarios' Epitome of *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Summa theologiae*, I^a Pars

Some time after the fall of Constantinople, Scholarios, now in radically different circumstances, set out to abridge the *Summa contra Gentiles* and I^a Pars of the *Summa theologiae*.¹³⁸ These two epitomes make up cod. *Par. gr. 1273 in toto*, which M. Jugie dated *post 1464*.¹³⁹ His argument for this date, stated briefly, was made clearer by M.-H. Blanchet, who regards Jugie's dating as historically possible but not necessary:

¹³⁰ See Eustratiades and monk Arcadios 1924, 55. Cf. Papadopoulos 1967d, 38, n. 68; J.A. Demetra-copoulos 2007, 344, n. 92.

¹³¹ See Cacouros 2000, 405; 416–420; 431.

¹³² See Frassinetti 1953, 80–81. Cf. Legrand 1885, 151; Papadopoulos 1967d, 38, n. 68.

¹³³ See Blanchet 2008b, 283.

¹³⁴ Fonkitch 2002, 246; 249.

¹³⁵ See Devreesse 1945, 259–260.

¹³⁶ See Cacouros 2000, 419–420.

¹³⁷ Ed. Cacouros 2000, 436; 2013, 24*–25*. That the translator is Demetrios Kydones can be inferred from the fact that, as Fonkitch found (2002, 244–245), the translation in the earliest of the three codices, i. e. cod. *Vatop.* 254 (14th cent.), is an autograph.

¹³⁸ Eds. Jugie et al., tome V, Paris 1931. See also Appendix III, pp. 167, 169.

¹³⁹ On the date, see Jugie et al., *op. cit.*, tome V, p. VI (cf. Timnefeld 2002a, 518); Blanchet 2008b, 217–218. This date is verified by the way in which Scholarios utilized Aquinas in his five-piece *On Divine Foreknowledge and Predestination*; those pieces that antedate his *Compendia* are based on Demetrios

Scholarios [...] disposait bien des ouvrages de Thomas d'Aquin tant qu'il se trouvait à Istanbul, mais il avait été contraint de s'en séparer lors d'un de ses voyages. Selon M. Jugie, il aurait donc profité de son troisième retour forcé à Istanbul, à partir de 1464, pour entreprendre ces résumés, alors qu'il retrouvait sur place les traductions de Démétrios Kydonès, et se serait consacré à cette tâche....¹⁴⁰

Blanchet thinks it possible in principle that

cette activité été entamée avant 1464, lors du séjour de Scholarios à Vatopédi ou lors de son deuxième retour forcé à Istanbul, dans la mesure où les Résumés eux-mêmes ne sont pas datés; cependant le fait que ces séjours aient été probablement assez courts incite plutôt à pencher pour le troisième retour forcé, assurément plus long.¹⁴¹

I think Jugie's dating is based on an erroneous interpretation of the relevant lines from Scholarios' Preface to these epitomes,¹⁴² where Scholarios explained that he took pains in producing them because it was practically impossible to carry with him two such large works of Thomas, which, however, he wanted accessible to him at any time. He created, so to speak, a personal one-volume, pocket edition as a solution to his problem. Scholarios says that the *Summa contra Gentiles* and I^a Pars of the *Summa theologiae* were “πρὸ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας ἐκγεγραμμένα καὶ ὑστερον ἐκ τῆς διασπορᾶς ἐπανευρημένα ἡμῖν”.¹⁴³ The first phrase obviously refers to: (i) cod. *Taur. Gr. XXIII* and (ii) *Vatop. 255* or *Coisl. 279/280* (see *supra*, pp. 151–152), which can be plausibly considered as copies (“ἐκγεγραμμένα”) for his sake and/or even by him (“ἡμῖν”),¹⁴⁴ whereas the second phrase suggests that, upon his return to Constantinople after 1453 (presumably during his patriarchate), he found these two books of his in the place where he had left them.¹⁴⁵ Further, Scholarios says that, after the capture of Constantinople, he

Kydones' translation of the *Summa theologiae*, whereas the pieces that postdate it are based on the *Compendia* (see J.A. Demetracopoulos 2007, 314, n. 36).

¹⁴⁰ Blanchet 2008b, 217–218.

¹⁴¹ Blanchet 2008b, 218.

¹⁴² Eds. Jugie et al., *op. cit.*, tome V, 1, 1–3. Cacourous (2013, 134*; 140*), in his refreshing re-examination of Jugie's interpretation of Scholarios' Preface to the epitomes in cod. *Par. gr. 1273*, seems to follow him in this.

¹⁴³ Eds. Jugie et al., tome V, 1, 6–7.

¹⁴⁴ See Cacourous 2013, 35*–36*.

¹⁴⁵ These lines probably suggest that Scholarios' abridgments were made on the basis of the above-mentioned manuscripts. Needless to say, this is to be checked by collating the texts themselves. Turner (1969, 426), based on an unedited Scholarian *frustulum* on divine predestination (“Οτι ὁ Θεὸς τὰ μὲν θέλει γίνεσθαι ἐν ἡμῖν ὥρισμένη θελήσει ... τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ὄρμῃ ἐπὶ τὸ χείρον ή ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἐπακολουθεῖ”), which occurs after Bk. I of the *Summa contra Gentiles* in the 15th-cent. cod. *Laur. Conv. Soppr. 117* (see Rostagno and Festa 1893, 156), speculates that Scholarios' abridgment of the *Summa contra Gentiles* could have been made on the basis of this manuscript. To the reasonable reservations expressed by Cacourous (2013, 36*) one can add that this manuscript contains only Books I–II (see Rostagno and Festa, *ibid.*), which is less than a half of this Thomistic work.

“was spending all of his life in involuntary wanderings and movings about” (“πλάναις καὶ μεταβάσεσιν ἀκουσίοις”).¹⁴⁶ Jugie construed this plural as referring to Scholarios’ three moves to Constantinople, the latest one having taken place in 1464. Yet, this is not what Scholarios says. He simply says that, after 1453, he had no stable residence, the first forced move being from Adrianople (where he stayed after the fall of Constantinople¹⁴⁷) to Constantinople for his patriarchate. Hence, Blanchet’s suggestion that cod. *Par. gr. 1273* could in principle have been produced any time between 1454 and 1464 is quite plausible.

What about the objection that producing the *Compendia* required a rather long period of time, which presumably points to Scholarios’ third sojourn in Constantinople? I think there is no need to assume that Scholarios produced cod. *Par. gr. 1273* in Constantinople or in some monastery of the city. Taken it as probable that Scholarios found cod. *Taur. Gr. XXIII* and *Vatop. 255* upon his return to Constantinople in 1454, we can assume that he wanted to keep (and actually had) both of these with him during some of his moves after 1456 and that, at some point, he became fed up with carrying them and therefore decided to abridge them – a task that was not necessarily carried out in Constantinople. This interpretation of Scholarios’ words detaches the production of cod. *Par. gr. 1273* from Scholarios’ second and third moves to Constantinople (his alleged second and third patriarchates¹⁴⁸) and instead posits 1454 or, more plausibly, early 1456 (when Scholarios, having resigned, had more time for literary work) as a *terminus post quem* for the *Compendia* of *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Summa theologiae*, Ia Pars.

A more accurate date is offered by the fact that “the source of Scholarios’ Thomism in *On divine Providence and Predestination I* (1458/59) was *Summa theologiae*, I^a Pars and *Summa contra Gentiles* (in Demetrios Kydones’ translation), whereas the Thomistic elements of the remaining four treatises (II–V; 1467/70) can be accounted for in terms of Scholarios’ utilisation of the *Compendia* of *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Summa theologiae*, I^a Pars, which he had meanwhile elaborated” (see *supra*, p. 153, n. 139). This means that the *Compendia* were compiled after 1458/59 and earlier than 1467/70. Studying cod. *Par. gr. 1273*¹⁴⁹ as well as detecting more evidence on Scholarios’ utilization of his own *Compendia* in his dated writings can shed more light on the date issue.

¹⁴⁶ Eds. Jugie et al., tome V, 1, 10.

¹⁴⁷ See Blanchet 2008b, 70–72.

¹⁴⁸ See Blanchet 2001b.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Blanchet 2008b, 218, n. 147.

3.3 Scholarios' epitome of *Summa theologiae*, I^a II^{ae} and abridgment of II^a II^{ae}

Scholarios also abridged I^a II^{ae} in full.¹⁵⁰ This is part of cod. *Vat. gr.* 433, i. e. fol. 81–179,¹⁵¹ written by Scholarios himself.¹⁵² M. Jugie estimated that “ce résumé a dû être exécuté à la même époque et pour la même raison que les deux autres”,¹⁵³ i. e. the *Compendia of Summa contra Gentiles* and I^a Pars. Yet, this connection is unfounded. Scholarios' opening words in the Preface to his *Compendia of Summa contra Gentiles* and I^a Pars quite clearly state that “touti τὸ βιβλίον δυοῖν βιβλίοιν ἔστιν ἐπιτομή, ἐνὸς μὲν τοῦ Κατὰ ἑθνικῶν..., ἐτέρου δὲ τοῦ πρώτου τῶν Θεολογικῶν”.¹⁵⁴ By “βιβλίον” Scholarios refers to cod. *Par. gr.* 1273 as a whole,¹⁵⁵ and makes no mention of or allusion to I^a II^{ae}. Obviously, at that time, I^a II^{ae} was not within his scope and activity, perhaps because cod. *Vat. gr.* 433, being smaller than any full copy of Demetrios Kydones' translation of the *Summa contra Gentiles* and the *Summa theologiae*, I^a Pars, was still in Scholarios' possession and easy to carry from place to place, if he liked.

Cod. *Vat. gr.* 433 is not a dated manuscript. According to R. Devreesse,¹⁵⁶ the watermark of folia 164–179 is similar to Briquet 3663 (Prague, 1445) and 3370 (Treviso, 1458). A more detailed and careful examination shows that the watermark of fol. 81, 87, 92, 94, 99, 103, 105, 109, 114, 120, 126, 128, 130, 132, 138, 144, 147, 149, and 160 is similar to Harlfinger, unidentified 1 (AD 1453), whereas the watermark of fol. 172, 178, and 179 is similar to Harlfinger, scissors 38 (AD 1451 or 1452).¹⁵⁷ So, it seems that this epitome was produced later than the production of cod. *Taur. Gr. XXIII (Summa contra Gentiles)* and cod. *Par. gr.* 1237 (II^a II^{ae}), whose watermarks are earlier and very close, if not identical (see *supra*, p. 131, n. 9). This means that the epitome of I^a II^{ae} probably did not take precedence over that of II^a II^{ae}. If so, why Scholarios did not follow the overall structure of the *Summa*? A tentative answer will be given after examining some more evidence on the date of the epitome of I^a II^{ae}.

As has been shown, fol. 68r–69r from cod. *Par. gr.* 1932, which date from 1436, contain a selective abridgment of some *quaestiones* of I^a II^{ae}, written in Scholarios' hand.¹⁵⁸ This shows that Scholarios, around the time in which he was building up the Thomistic section of his personal library, had, for reasons still unexplored, some

¹⁵⁰ Eds. Jugie et al., tome VI, 1–153.

¹⁵¹ See Devreesse 1937, 160–162.

¹⁵² That the relevant folia of cod. *Vat. gr.* 433 were written by Scholarios' hand is stated by Jugie et al., *op. cit.*, tome VI, p. V–VI; 1, asterisk.

¹⁵³ Jugie et al., *op. cit.*, tome V, p. VI. Cf. Tinnefeld 2002a, 518; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2014b, 826.

¹⁵⁴ Eds. Jugie et al., tome V, 1, 1–3.

¹⁵⁵ See Cacouros 2013, 28*–30*.

¹⁵⁶ Devreesse 1937, 161.

¹⁵⁷ Many thanks to Prof. Daniele Bianconi (Rome) for his help in identifying the watermarks.

¹⁵⁸ See Cacouros 2000, 405; 407; 410; 431. Scholarios abridged the following material: qu. 21 (“De his quae consequuntur actus humanos ratione bonitatis et malitiae”), art. 3 (“Utrum [actus humanus]

special interest in certain specific topics of Aquinas' general ethics. Cod. *Par. gr.* 1274 contains an abridgment of I^a II^{ae}, from qu. 1 to qu. 71, Prol. Comparison of its relevant folia (96r–116r) to Scholarios' abridged excerpts in cod. *Par. gr.* 1932 shows no dependence in either direction. Likewise, comparison of Scholarios' excerpts to the corresponding parts of his full abridgment of I^a II^{ae} shows no dependence either way. This suggests that, by 1436, Scholarios had access to some manuscript that contained Demetrios Kydones' full translation of I^a II^{ae},¹⁵⁹ but had not as yet produced his full *Compendium* of I^a II^{ae}.¹⁶⁰ Indeed, should we suppose that Scholarios wanted to produce some excerpts from I^a II^{ae}, it would be absurd to assume that he ignored his own full abridgment and searched for the full text of this Thomistic writing again.

This fits with the fact that Scholarios, as a teacher of philosophy, by 1433 at the earliest or 1435 at the latest, proved highly productive in translating several longer or shorter philosophical works (by Thomas and others).¹⁶¹ Scholarios had just finished his intensive work on the copies of the *Summa contra Gentiles* and the *Summa theologiae*, I^a Pars (see *supra*, pp. 151–152),¹⁶² to start his much more demanding and time-consuming work of abridging, excerpting, translating and annotating on the Byzantine and Scholastic writings he utilised to produce the handbooks for his courses of

habeat rationem meriti vel demeriti") and 4 ("Utrum [actus humanus] habeat rationem meriti vel demeriti apud Deum"); qu. 22 ("De passionibus animae in generali"), art. 1 ("De subjecto earum, scilicet utrum aliqua passio sit in anima"); qu. 24 ("De bono et malo circa passiones animi"), art. 3 ("Utrum passio addat vel diminuat ad bonitatem vel malitiam actus"); qu. 25 ("De ordine passionum ad invicem"), art. 4 ("Utrum istae quatuor, scilicet gaudium, tristitia, spes et timor, sint principales passiones"); qu. 26 ("De passionibus animae in speciali"), art. 3 ("Utrum amor sit idem quod dilectio"); qu. 27 ("De causa amoris"), art. 1 ("Utrum bonum sit sola causa amoris"), 2 ("Utrum cognitio sit causa amoris") and 3 ("Utrum similitudo sit causa amoris"); and qu. 28 ("De effectibus amoris"), art. 1 ("Utrum unio sit effectu amoris"). Cacouros dates this selective abridgment to c. 1435 on codicological grounds. Blanchet (2008, 293–294) argues that Scholarios' *Epistle 18* (ed. Jugie et al., tome IV, 436, 28–438, 3), which was addressed to Bessarion and is extant in cod. *Par. gr.* 1932 (fol. 61r), written in Scholarios' hand, must be dated to 1436. Granted (see Cacouros, *ibid.*) that this is an autograph, one can plausibly assume that fol. 61 was the original on the basis of which the copy mailed to Bessarion was made.

¹⁵⁹ The only such extant manuscript is *Marc. Gr. 147* (see Mioni 1981b, 208).

¹⁶⁰ More light on Scholarios' abridgment of and excerpts from I^a II^{ae} is going to be shed by P.C. Athanasopoulos (Venice), currently working on the *editio princeps* of Demetrios Kydones' translation of I^a II^{ae}.

¹⁶¹ See J. A. Demetracopoulos 2017a.

¹⁶² Indeed, the case was not that Scholarios was just ordering copies, remunerating the scribe and carrying the volume home. For instance, in the case of cod. *Vatop.* 255, "Scholarios (...) a été à la fois lecteur, réviseur et commanditaire"; he added a Table of Contents and, very often, the *quaestio* numbers and titles in the margins, repaired the scribe's omissions, and added several personal notes here and there (see the detailed description of Scholarios' major contribution to the production of this manuscript by Cacouros 2000, 417–419 et passim).

philosophy.¹⁶³ Apparently, there was no room for any parallel work on the huge II^a, on either of its two Parts.

This suggests that the abridgment of the two Parts of II^a took place later than 1436. How much later? Scholarios produced cod. *Par. gr. 1237*, which contains II^a II^{aε}, in collaboration with the prolific scribe George Baiophoros (probably born c. 1370/80), whose earliest dated manuscript was produced in 1402 and whose latest in 1433/34.¹⁶⁴ The time span of Baiophoros' activity, which extends to three full decades, renders it implausible that his collaboration with Scholarios took place during an alleged fourth decade of scribal activity, namely, later than the thirties. Although a fourth decade is possible, there is no evidence for it. So, a plausible scenario is that Scholarios' access to I^a II^{aε} by 1436, which enabled him to make his excerpts in *Par. gr. 1932*, inspired him to produce a full epitome of I^a II^{aε}. While doing so, Baiophoros was implementing Scholarios' order to copy II^a II^{aε} (presumably using the same tirage of paper as the paper with the earliest of the watermarks mentioned above, p. 155). Upon Baiophoros' reaching qu. 64, Scholarios could have finished his epitome of I^a II^{aε} (the Compendium's length is 1/6 of Thomas' text), and continued the work on the bulky II^a II^{aε} by abridging its remaining *quaestiones*, thereby completing his plan to have a personal copy of II^a in its entirety. To him then a palace preacher, the abridgment of a treatise on special ethics, which contains a full list of philosophical and theological virtues and vices, proved useful: it helped him to compose at least two of his homilies, i. e. the *On Fasting* and the *On Almsgiving*. After his expulsion from the palace by the emperor Constantine XI Palaiologos (and probably even before it), Scholarios made use of II^a II^{aε} (along with I^a and *Summa contra Gentiles*) in some of his writings against Pletho.

Still, there is no compelling reason to think that the abridgment of I^a II^{aε} took precedence over the epitome of II^a II^{aε}. As II^a II^{aε} was more useful for his homilies,

163 Incidentally, Scholarios' endnote to the part of his handbook on *Ars vetus* regarding ch. 9 of the *De Interpretatione* (see *supra*, p. 129, n. 4), which refers the reader to Thomas' discussion of God's knowledge of future contingents (*Summa theologiae*, I^a, qu. 14, art. 13: "Utrum scientia Dei sit futuorum contingentium"), is rather sure evidence that Scholarios' elaboration of this handbook postdates his acquisition of codd. *Vatop. 255* and/or *Coisl. 279* and *280*, which were his personal copies of I^a Pars (see *supra*, pp. 151–152). Scholarios says that, in this article of the chapter ("κεφάλαιον") "Περὶ τῆς θείας ἐπιστήμης", Thomas discusses "Εἰ ὁ Θεός ἐπίσταται τὰ ἐνδεχόμενα τὰ μέλλοντα" (eds. Jugie et al., *op. cit.*, tome VII, 300, 28–31). In the body of I^a Pars in this manuscript, the title of the article reads: "Εἰ τῶν μελλόντων συμβεβηκότων ἔστιν ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιστήμη" (cod. *Vatop. 255*, fol. 70v; cod. *Coisl. 279*, fol. 102v). Scholarios seems to have conflated the title on the basis of these titles: Qu. 13 ("Περὶ τῆς θείας ἐπιστήμης"), art. 9 ("Εἰ καὶ τῶν μὴ ὄντων ἔστιν ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιστήμη") and art. 13 ("Εἰ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων μελλόντων") (cod. *Vatop. 255*, fol. 3r; cf. Cacourous 2013, 150*–151*; cod. *Coisl. 279*, fol. 3v–4r; 90v; 98v). In the body of cod. *Coisl. 279*, the title of art. 13 reads: "Εἰ τῶν μελλόντων συμβεβηκότων ἔστιν ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιστήμη" (fol. 102v). Presumably, Scholarios' reference to Aquinas was based on the titles in the Table of Contents of either of the two manuscripts or both.

164 See Cataldi Palau 2008, 281–282; 284; 289–290.

Scholarios may have temporarily skipped I^a II^{ae}, started from II^a II^{ae} and went back to I^a II^{ae} after he left the palace. This fits with the evidence. On some pages of cod. *Vat. gr. 433*, there are some autograph anti-Latin notes by him.¹⁶⁵ This may indicate that the manuscript was produced after Scholarios' conversion to the anti-unionist camp, i. e. after 1445.¹⁶⁶ Likewise, on the upper margin of the first page of the Epitome of I^a II^{ae}, Scholarios signs as “Γεννάδιος” (“Ιησοῦ Χριστέ, ἐλέησόν με τὸν ἀμαρτωλὸν Γεννάδιον”),¹⁶⁷ which may indicate that the epitome was made in 1450 or later (even if it is quite possible that Scholarios added this note some time after its composition).

Let us examine Scholarios' later decision to fully epitomize *Summa contra Gentiles* and I^a Pars (“...τριῶν ὄντων τῶν ἀκολούθως [sc. as sequels to I^a Pars] συντεταγμένων”) omitting the remaining “three” Parts of the *Summa theologiae*.¹⁶⁸ Apparently, Scholarios decided to part with the full copies of *Summa contra Gentiles* and I^a Pars that he had obtained (and conscientiously corrected) two decades earlier, which he presumably decided to use for the last time in order to produce their epitomes in cod. *Par. gr. 1273*.

What about the Compendium of I^a II^{ae} at that time? Did Scholarios still have his early epitome in his possession? Since the relevant part of *Vat. gr. 433* was produced by his own hand, he was presumably reluctant to part with it; besides, the manuscript was not that large. Yet, this is not enough for us to make sure either way. Further research into the direct influence of Aquinas' general ethics on Scholarios' dated writings would shed light on this issue.

As for Scholarios' partially autograph copy/abridgment of II^a II^{ae}, we do not know whether, at the time when he decided to produce the *Compendia* of *Summa contra Gentiles* and I^a Pars (i. e., probably after 1458/59 and earlier than 1467/70), he still had access to it. One can plausibly assume that, at that time, he left II^a II^{ae} out of his abridgment project because it had been already abridged in its greater part, i. e. over two-thirds of it (see *supra*, p. 131, note 9).

Research into the influence of Aquinas' special ethics on Scholarios' writings would offer more evidence on the dating issue. For instance, Scholarios, in his discussion of points 10 and 11 (on morality) of Plethon's *On the Issues on Which Aristotle Contentiously Disagrees with Plato*, argues that, according to Aristotle, moral virtue, though it is described as “means” between the two extremes, does not fall under the category of “quantity”, but of “quality”. To show this, he describes it as follows:

...αὐτὴν εἶναι μεσότητα τὴν ἀρετῆν, ἢ μὲν μεσότητα ποσῷ δήπου ὄριζομένην, καθ' αὐτὴν δὲ ἐν ποιότητι οὖσαν· ἡθικῆς γὰρ ἀρετῆς ὑποκείμενον μὲν ἀνθρώπου ψυχῇ, τοῦ γε σπουδαίου, ὥλη δὲ

¹⁶⁵ See Mercati 1920, 123. Cf. Devreesse 1937, 160.

¹⁶⁶ See Blanchet 2008b, 410–424.

¹⁶⁷ Devreesse 1937, 161.

¹⁶⁸ Eds. Jugie et al., tome V, 1, 3.

πάθη καὶ πράξεις αὐτῆς, εἶδος δὲ ισότης τις αὐτῶν καὶ ἀναλογίᾳ ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν ἔχοντα παραθέσει κατὰ τὰς λοιπὰς περιστάσεις, φύσις δὲ αὐτῆς καὶ γένος ποιότης.¹⁶⁹

This seems to be a summary of Aquinas' I^a II^{ae}, qu. 55 ("De virtutibus quantum ad earum essentias"), art. 4 ("Utrum virtus convenienter definiatur"), Resp., where virtue is described by means of its causes (in terms of the Aristotelian fourfold set of causes):

Ἡ γὰρ εἰδικὴ αἰτία τῆς ἀρετῆς... ἐκ τοῦ γένους καὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς λαμβάνεται, ὡς ὅταν λέγηται «ποιότης ἀγαθή»· ἡ γὰρ ποιότης τῆς ἀρετῆς γένος ἔστι, διαφορὰ δὲ τάγαθόν. Οίκειότερος δ' ἂν ἦν ὁ ὄρος, εἰ ἀντὶ τῆς ποιότητος «ἔξις» ἔκειτο, ἡ ἔστι προσεχές γένος. Ἡ δὲ ἀρετὴ οὐκ ἔχει ὑλην ἐξ ἣς, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὰ ἄλλα συμβεβηκότα, ἀλλ' ἔχει ὑλην περὶ ἣν καὶ ὑλην ἐν ᾧ, τουτέστιν ὑποκείμενον. Ἡ δὲ ὑλη περὶ ἣν τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἔστιν ἀντικείμενον... Ἐνταῦθα... ὡς τῆς ἀρετῆς ὄρος κοινῶς ἀποδίδοται· ὅθεν τίθεται τὸ ὑποκείμενον ἀντὶ τῆς ὑλικῆς αἰτίας, ὡς ὅταν λέγηται «ἀγαθὴ ποιότης διανοίας». Τέλος δὲ τῆς ἀρετῆς, πρακτικῆς ἔξεως οὕσης, αὐτὴ ἔστιν ἡ πρᾶξις.¹⁷⁰

To my knowledge, no other Greek text (such as the ancient Greek and Byzantine commentaries on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*) can account for the wording of Scholarios' lines. This holds true for the relevant lines from Scholarios' own abridgment of I^a II^{ae}.¹⁷¹ If we assume that this abridgment, like the abridgments of the *Summa contra Gentiles* and I^a Pars (see *supra*, pp. 152–154), were meant as replacements of the text abridged, then we can plausibly infer that, since Scholarios, when writing his *Against the Impasses That Plethon Ignorantly Imputes to Aristotle*, i. e. after Constantine Palaiologos became despot of Mistra (1443) and before the death of Mark Eugenikos (1445),¹⁷² still had access to the full text of Demetrios Kydones' translation of I^a II^{ae}, he had not so far effected his abridgment of I^a II^{ae}—namely, that this abridgment was produced after 1443/45. This renders it probable that the abridgment of II^a II^{ae} took precedence.

3.4 Scholarios' inaccessibility to the *Summa theologiae*, III^a Pars and *Supplementum*

What about III^a Pars and its *Supplementum*? Scholarios, as is obvious from his autograph note edited in Appendix III (see *infra*, p. 171), counted the two sub-divisions of II^a as two distinct Parts. This means that his mention of "three Parts" does not include the *Supplementum*, which, as he himself says in the same note, he had not seen. Like

¹⁶⁹ Eds. Jugie et al., tome IV, 89, 22–26.

¹⁷⁰ Cod. Marc. Gr. 147, fol. 190r. Cf. *supra*, p. 157, n. 163.

¹⁷¹ Eds. Jugie et al., tome VI, 59, 18–60, 2.

¹⁷² For this dating, see Jugie et al., tome IV, p. IV; Tinnefeld 2002a, 484; 515. On the date of Mark's death, see Constas 2002a, 411; 421.

III^a Pars, the *Supplementum* had not been translated into Greek in its entirety.¹⁷³ Still, one cannot ignore the fact that a passage from Mark Eugenikos' (most probably died 23 June 1445) *De hominis imbecillitate*, which was probably written shortly after 1426,¹⁷⁴ exhibits clear traces of influence from the *Supplementum*, qu. 91, art. 1 Resp.¹⁷⁵ Since this mentor of Scholarios (who was probably one of the sources of Scholarios' positive acquaintance with Aquinas' and other Scholastics' thought) had access to some articles of III^a Pars, untranslated as far as we know, one cannot exclude the possibility that Scholarios had access to the same Latin material, probably thanks to his ties to certain Dominicans of Pera.¹⁷⁶ In general, both Eugenikos and Scholarios made use of various Latin sources that remained untranslated into Greek.¹⁷⁷ Given that Scholarios, probably after 1458/59, stated that he had for a time access to the entire (Latin) corpus Thomisticum,¹⁷⁸ this access may have become available after his note on cod. *Vatop.* 254 had been written, i. e. probably after 1456. There is, in any case, no current evidence that Scholarios ever worked on III^a Pars or its *Supplementum*.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷³ See Mercati 1931b, 33–36. Cf. Papadopoulos 1967d, 52; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2014b, 826. As far as we know, the *quaestiones* selectively translated by Prochoros Kydones are extant only in cod. *Vat. gr. 1102*. On why this manuscript was unavailable to Scholarios, see *infra*, Appendix III, p. 169.

¹⁷⁴ See Pilavakis 1987a, 65.

¹⁷⁵ J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010f, 369, n. 327; cf. J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010f, 84.

¹⁷⁶ See Blanchet 2008b, 302–303 (with previous bibliography).

¹⁷⁷ See bibliography in: J. A. Demetracopoulos 2017b, n. 61. See also Pino's article in this volume, pp. 291–307.

¹⁷⁸ J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010f, 847.

¹⁷⁹ My thanks to Dr Panagiotis Athanasopoulos (Venice), Irini Balcoyannopoulou, Cand. Phil. (Patras), and Dr Marie-Hélène Blanchet (Paris) for our collaboration in the framework of the Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus project, which proved useful with regard to several specific issues discussed in this study. Special thanks are owed to Prof. Denis Searby (Stockholm) for his patient and careful reading of my paper and his valuable suggestions.

Appendix I: A list of correspondences in Scholarios' *Sermon on Almsgiving* with Thomas Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*

This is a progressive list of parallels in Scholarios' *Sermon on Almsgiving*. It captures his movements as he browsed back and forth through Thomas' II^a II^{ae} (based on his own codex, i. e. *Par. gr. 1237*) and, in a single case, I^a (presumably based on his own codices, i. e. *Vatop. 255* and/or *Coisl. 279/280*) while producing the Sermon. References to Scholarios' text are made to page and line number of Jugie's edition. *Quaestio-* numbers refer to II^a II^{ae}, unless otherwise noted.

Par. 1

91, 29–30 = qu. 147, art. 1 via Scholarios' *Sermon on Fasting*, 83, 15–27

91, 33–92, 4 = qu. 26, art. 5 ad 3^{um}; qu. 26, art. 3 s.c. and Resp.; qu. 26, art. 4 Resp.

Par. 2

93, 15–19 = qu. 27, art. 8 Resp.

Par. 3

93, 28–29 = qu. 79, art. 1 + I^a Pars, qu. 21, art. 3 ad 2^{um}

Par. 4

93, 33–36 = qu. 32 tit.; qu. 32, art. 1 tit.; qu. 23, art. 6 tit.

93, 36–38 = qu. 32, art. 1 ad 1^{um}

93, 38–94, 3 = qu. 32, art. 1 ad 1^{um}

94, 11–13 = qu. 32, art. 4 tit.

94, 13–16 = qu. 32, art. 4 s.c.

94, 16–19 = qu. 32, art. 5, arg. 1

94, 27–29 = qu. 32, art. 4 s.c.

94, 30–33 = qu. 32, art. 4 s.c.

94, 33–35 = qu. 10, art. 4 s.c.

Par. 5

95, 3–22 = qu. 32, art. 5 Resp.

95, 22–96, 2 = qu. 32, art. 6 tit.; qu. 32, art. 10 ad 2^{um}; qu. 32, art. 6 Resp.

Par. 6

96, 5–8 = qu. 32, art. 4, arg. 3 and ad 3^{um}

96, 20–26 = qu. 32 art. 2 Resp.

96, 26–97, 3 = qu. 32 art. 2 Resp.

Par. 7

97, 24–30 = qu. 30, art. 4, arg. 3 and Resp.; qu. 30, art. 2 Resp.; I^a Pars, qu. 21, art. 3 Resp.

97, 31–33 = qu. 30, art. 4 ad 3^{um}

Par. 8

97, 34–98, 16 = qu. 31, art. 2 Resp.; qu. 31, art. 3 Resp.; qu. 32, art. 6 Resp.; qu. 32, art. 3, arg. 3; qu. 32, art. 6, arg. 6; qu. 32, art. 9, arg. 2

98, 17–20 = qu. 31, art. 3 Resp.

Par. 9

98, 21–30 = qu. 32, art. 7, arg. 1, Resp. and ad 1^{um}

98, 30–32 = qu. 32, art. 7 Resp.

98, 32–36 = qu. 78, art. 1 Resp.

98, 36–99, 2 = qu. 78, art. 1 s.c.

99, 3–12 = qu. 78, art. 1 Resp.

Par. 10

99, 13–18 = qu. 32, art. 5 s.c.

99, 30–100, 3 = qu. 32, art. 5 ad 2^{um}

Par. 11

101, 5–7: cf. qu. 32, art. 7 ad 1^{um}

Needless to say, some cases may have escaped my attention. More research is needed. For instance, some Scholarian words and phrases in the lines not included in the above list are redolent of Latin.¹⁸⁰ It is probable so that part of or even all of this wording derived from some hitherto unidentified Latin source, perhaps Thomas again.

180 See, e.g.: “ἀπαραβλήτως” (*incomparabiliter*); “τῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀποβλέψει” (*respectu Dei* or *respectu ad Deum*) (a phrase occurring in several Scholarian texts); “τῶν ... θρησκευμάτων” (*expiationes?*); “τὸ δραστήριον” (*efficientia* or *efficacitas*); “ἀτομότητα” (*individuatio* or *individualitas*) (Scholarios, *On Almsgiving* 2; 3; 6; 7; eds. Jugie et al., tome I, 92, 20; 92, 22; 93, 10; 96, 10; 97, 15–17).

Appendix II: A chronological table of Scholarios' acquisition of or access to Thomistic and pseudo-Thomistic writings

No references are made to dates established by M. Jugie in his edition of Scholarios' writings. For that purpose, one may consult Tinnefeld 2002a, where Jugie's datings are reproduced in an orderly way. References are made regarding datings suggested by other scholars or inferred from studies by other scholars.

Date	Writing	Greek manuscript/-s	Study/-ies
1431/32	<i>Summa theologiae</i> , I ^a in Demetrios Kydones' translation, produced on the basis of some still unidentified MS, at S.'s request	<i>Vatop.</i> 255 (with some notes by S.; owned by S.); it includes (f. 1v) Scholarios' copy of Demetrios Kydones' translation of Aquinas' <i>Quaestiones quodlibetales</i> I, qu. 1	Eustratiades and monk Arcadios 1924, 55; Kadas 2000, 47–48
unknown	<i>Summa theologiae</i> , I ^a in Demetrios Kydones' translation, copied by S.	<i>Cisl.</i> 279 and 280 (an autograph copy of <i>Vatop.</i> 255); <i>Cisl.</i> 279, f. 1v includes Scholarios' copy of Demetrios Kydones' translation of Aquinas' <i>Quaestiones quodlibetales</i> I, qu. 1	Devreesse 1945, 259–260; Cacouros 2000, 419–420; 434; Cacouros 2013, 24*; present article, pp. 151–152; 156, n. 162

Date	Writing	Greek manuscript/-s	Study/-ies
1432, Nov.	<i>Summa contra Gentiles</i> in Demetrios Kydones' translation, produced on the basis of some still unidentified MS., at S.'s request	<i>Taur. gr. XXIII</i> (C-II-16) (owned by S.)	Frassinetti 1953, 80–81
1433/35, before the <i>Commentary on Aristotle's De Interpretatione</i>	<i>Commentary on Aristotle's Posterior Analytics</i> , translated by S. (translation lost)	unknown and lost	Scholarios' <i>Ars vetus</i> , ed. Jugie et al., t. VIII, 4, 34–5, 12
1433/35	<i>Commentary on Aristotle's De Interpretatione</i> , translated <i>in extenso</i> (literally or in an abridged form) by S. as part of his handbook of <i>Ars vetus</i>	<i>Mut. gr. 50</i> , f. 137r–172v; <i>Par. gr. 1941</i> , f. 104r–130v; <i>Barb. gr. 124</i> , f. 162r–212v; <i>Vat. gr. 2223</i> , f. 147r–188r (autographs; <i>Mut. gr. 50</i> contains the final redaction)	J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010d, 88–89; more passages in Balcoyannopoulou, p. 93 in this volume
probably before 1436	Περὶ διαφορᾶς τῶν συγγνωστῶν καὶ θανασίμων ἀμαρτημάτων σύντομον καὶ σαφές, which consists of material directly drawn from Demetrios Kydones' translation of Ia Iliae and IIa Iliae	<i>Par. gr. 1289</i> , f. 130v–137v (autograph; ed. M. Jugie et al., IV, 274–284)	present article, p. 152, n. 120; Athanasopoulos 2017a.
1435/36	Ps.-Thomas Aquinas' <i>De fallaciis</i> , translated by S.	<i>Laur. Plut.</i> 71.33, f. 29–44; <i>Misc. Oxon. gr.</i> 275, f. 311–321; <i>Mut. gr. 50</i> , f. 223–238 (autographs)	Jugie et al., t. VIII, pp. v–vi
before 1438 (probably before c. 1435, i. e. before S.'s translation of Aquinas' <i>Comm. on De anima</i> , which was normally given precedence over the <i>Physics</i> in the Medieval philosophical courses	<i>Commentary on Aristotle's Physics</i> , partially translated (I.1, 3–15 and II.1–12) by S.	<i>Laur. Plut.</i> 86.19, f. 36–37 (initium operis solum) (autograph)	Jugie et al., t. VIII, pp. iv; 163

Date	Greek manuscript/-s	Study/-ies	
c. 1435	<i>Commentary on Aristotle's De anima</i> , translated by S.	<i>Laur. Plut. 86.19; Vat. Pal. 235</i> (autographs)	Jugie et al., t. VI, p. x
(much?) earlier than 1443/45, probably after the partial translation of Aquinas' <i>Comm. on Physics</i>	<i>Commentary on Aristotle's Metaphysics</i> , translated by S. (translation lost)	<i>Escor. Δ.IV.8</i> (lost)	S. used this commentary in his <i>Κατὰ τῶν Πλάτωνος ἀποριῶν ἐπ' Ἀριστοτέλει</i> , which was written in 1443/44 (J. A. Demetracopoulos 2012b, 121–122; Athanasopoulos 2015, 401–427)
1436 or shortly after	S.'s epitome of <i>Summa theologiae</i> , Ia IIiae in Demetrios Kydones' translation, qu. 21, art. 3; 4; qu. 22, art. 1; qu. 24, art. 3; qu. 25, art. 4; qu. 26, art. 3; qu. 27, art. 1; 2; 3; qu. 28, art. 1	<i>Par. gr. 1932, f. 68r–69r</i> (autograph)	Cacouras 2000, 405; 407; 431
c. 1436 or a bit later	<i>Summa theologiae</i> , Ia IIiae in Demetrios Kydones' translation, identical up to qu. 64, art. 1 and abridged by S. from qu. 64 on; produced on the basis of some still unidentified MS.	<i>Par. gr. 1237</i> (partially autograph; revised by S. in its entirety)	Gamillscheg, D. Harlfinger, and Hunger 1989, 48; 54; present article, pp. 131, n. 9 and 155ff.
probably after c. 1443/45 and before 1458/59	<i>Summa theologiae</i> , Ia IIiae in Demetrios Kydones' translation, epitomized by S. on the basis of some still unidentified MS.	<i>Vat. gr. 433, f. 81–179</i> (autograph)	present article, p. 155ff.
between 1437/40 and 1447	Ps.-Thomas Aquinas' <i>De sacramento Eucharistiae ad modum praedicamentorum</i>	no extant Greek translation; S. had presumably access to some Latin manuscript	used by S. in the <i>Περὶ τοῦ μυστηριώδους σώματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ</i> , dated by Jugie 1930a, 432
between 1445 and 1450	<i>De ente et essentia</i> , translated by S.	<i>Misc. Oxon. 275; Par. Suppl. 618; Scor. Y.III.13; Laur. Plut. 86.27</i> (autographs)	Jugie et al., t. VI, pp. 8; 154

Date	Writing	Greek manuscript/-s	Study/-ies
between 1444/45 and 1453	S.'s <i>Florilegium Thomisticum I</i> (from Demetrios Kydones' translation of <i>Summa contra Gentiles</i> and <i>Summa theologiae</i> , I ^a (presumably on the basis of <i>Taur. Gr. XXIII</i> and <i>Vatop. 255</i>): <i>ScG</i> , Bk. II, ch. 49, par. 3; 5; 6; chs. 69 tit. and 70 summatim; ch. 79, par. 2; 3; 8; 9; 10; I, ch. 71; III, ch. 136, par. 1; 9; 10; 11; 13; 15; ch. 157, par. 2; 3; ch. 158, par. 1; 4; 5; 6; 7; <i>ST</i> I ^a , qu. 115, art. 4 Resp.; ad 2 ^{um} ; ad 3 ^{um} ; art. 6 s.c.; ad 1 ^{um} ; ad 3 ^{um} ; Resp. summatim; qu. 116, art. 1 Resp. summatim; qu. 115, art. 5 s.c.; ad 1 ^{um} ; ad 2 ^{um} ; ad 3 ^{um} ; qu. 117, art. 3 ad 2 ^{um} ; <i>ScG</i> II, ch. 56; ch. 57; ch. 83, par. 1; 9–12; 6–7; 1–3; 5; 20–22; 84, par. 1–5; ch. 83, par. 35; 26; 8; ch. 71), produced by S.	<i>Par. gr. 1868</i> , f. 30r–39v (autograph); <i>Marc. Gr. Cl. XI</i> , <i>10</i> (<i>coll. 1474</i>), f. 247r–279v	J.A. Demetracopoulos 2002, 161–168; 2007, 303–304, n. 6
between 1444/45 and 1453, presumably after the preceding item	S.'s <i>Florilegium Thomisticum II</i> (from Demetrios Kydones' translation of <i>Summa contra Gentiles</i> (presumably on the basis of <i>Taur. Gr. XXIII</i>), Bk. III: ch. 84, par. 8–14; ch. 85, par. 19–20; ch. 86, par. 9–14; ch. 87; ch. 93; chs. 105–106 summatim; ch. 101, par. 2 partim; ch. 103; ch. 94, par. 3–5 and 12–15), produced by S.	<i>Marc. Gr. Cl. XI</i> , <i>18</i> (<i>coll. 1042</i>), f. 9r–14v	J.A. Demetracopoulos 2007, 335–340
probably 1456	<i>Summa theologiae</i> , I ^a (Demetrios Kydones' translation)	<i>Vatop. 254</i> and <i>Mosqu. Syn.</i> 228 (accessed by S., with notes by him); <i>Vatop. 254</i> , f. 49r (in marg.) includes Demetrios Kydones' translation of Aquinas' <i>Quaestiones quodlibetales I</i> , qu. 1 (translator's hand)	Fonkitch 2002; present article, pp. 151–152 and Appendix II; Cacouros 2013, 24*–25*

Date	Writing	Greek manuscript/-s	Study/-ies
after 1458/59 and (presumably much) earlier than 1467/70	S.'s epitome of Demetrios Kydones' translation of <i>Summa contra Gentiles</i> and <i>Summa theologiae</i> , I ^a (presumably elaborated on the basis of <i>Taur.</i> <i>Gr. XXIII</i> and <i>Vatop. 255</i>)	<i>Par. gr. 1273</i> (autograph)	Jugie et al., t. V, p. V–VI
(long?) before 1467	<i>De potentia</i> , translated by Prochoros Kydones	unknown (<i>Par.</i> <i>Caisl. gr. 96</i> or some other manuscript)	On the manuscripts of the translation, see Devreesse 1945, 83; Konstantinou-Rizos, p. 259 in this volume. S.'s <i>Περὶ τῆς λογικῆς καὶ ἀνθρωπίνης ψυχῆς, δεύτερον</i> depends on qu. 3, art. 9, which is Aquinas' fullest account of the origins of the human soul; see J. A. Demetracopoulos 2017d

Appendix III: Scholarios' autograph note on Aquinas' *Summa theologiae* in cod. *Vatop.* 254

On fol. 1v of the 14th century cod. *Vatop.* 254, written by Manuel Tzykandyles and revised by Demetrios Kydones, containing the first part (*quaestiones* 1–43: on the science of theology and *Deus unus* and *trinus*) of I^a Pars of Aquinas' *Summa theologiae* in Kydones' translation, there is an autograph note by Scholarios regarding the *Summa theologiae*.¹⁸¹ As Fonkitch reasonably maintains,¹⁸² the manuscript was most probably produced (shortly) before 1357, since its sequel, which contains the remaining *quaestiones* of I^a Pars, i. e. cod. *Mosqu. Synod.* 228, was completed on November 13, 1357/58.

In paragraph 2, Scholarios' description of the *Summa theologiae* implies that he had before him the entire I^a Pars – not only qu. 1–43, which are contained in the manuscript nowadays classified as *Vatop.* 254, but also qu. 44 sqq., for he says that Aquinas “περὶ τῆς παρ’ αὐτοῦ [sc. God] προόδου τῶν κτισμάτων σκοπεῖ”. Besides, the fact that he calls I^a Pars “the present book” (“ταῦτα ... ἐν τῷ παρόντι βιβλίῳ θεωρεῖ”; see also par. 7: “τῷ ... παρόντι [sc. πονήματι”]) suggests that he is referring to I^a Pars as a whole, namely the tome on which he was writing.¹⁸³ This probably suggests that at the time, i. e. probably 1456, May–September,¹⁸⁴ cod. *Vatop.* 254 and its sequel, i. e. cod.

¹⁸¹ See Fonkitch 2002, 246. This is the fourth of the seven facsimiles included in Fonkitch's study. The third one is fol. 49r, where Scholarios' marginal note is a copy of Demetrios Kydones' translation of Aquinas' *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, qu. I, art. 1 (ed. Spiazzi 1949, 2), edited by Cacouros (2000, 434–436) on the basis of cod. *Vatop.* 255. Cf. *supra*, p. 152, n. 137.

¹⁸² Fonkitch 2002, 247–248.

¹⁸³ In using βιβλίον in this sense, Scholarios followed Demetrios Kydones, who used it interchangeably with μέρος, by σύνταγμα and πραγματεία denoting the entire *Summa*; see, e. g., *Summa theologiae*, I^a, qu. 83, art. 2 ad 3um: “...ἐν τῷ βῳ βιβλίῳ” (cod. *Vat. Gr.* 609, fol. 108v, 39; “...in secunda parte hujus operis”); qu. 84, proem: “...ἐν τῷ βῳ μέρει τῆς πραγματείας ταύτης” (cod. *Vat. Gr.* 609, fol. 109r, 16; “...in secunda parte hujus operis”); I^a II^a, qu. 4, art. 6 ad 3um: “...ἐν τῷ γῳ μέρει τοῦ Συντάγματος τούτου” (cod. *Marc. Gr.* 147, fol. 36r, 12; “...in tertia parte huius operis dicetur”); IIa II^a, qu. 88, art. 7 s.c.: “...ἐν τῷ γ' βιβλίῳ τῆς πραγματείας ταύτης” (“...in tertia hujus operis parte”); qu. 89, proem: “...ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ τῆς παρούσης πραγματείας” (“...in tertia hujus operis parte”); qu. 96, art. 1 Resp.: “ἐν τῷ α' τῆς πραγματείας ταύτης” (“...in prima hujus operis parte”); art. 3 ad 1um: “...ἐν τῷ α' βιβλίῳ” (“...parte prima”); qu. 100, art. 2, arg. 1: “...ἐν τῷ γ' ὥρθησεται” (“...in tertia parte dicetur”); ad 6um: “...ἐν τῷ γ' ὥρθησεται τῆς πραγματείας ταύτης” (“...in tertia parte hujus operis dicetur”) (ed. Glycofrydi-Leontsini and Spyralatos 2011, 167, 6–7; 184, 5–6; 273, 19–20; 278, 32–279, 1; 316, 8–9; 319, 9–10).

¹⁸⁴ On Scholarios' stay in the Vatopedi monastery, see Jugie et al., tome VIII, 30*; Blanchet 2008b, 210.

Mosqu. Syn. 228, formed a single book.¹⁸⁵ This is corroborated by the fact that some of the marginal additions in *Mosqu. Syn.* 228¹⁸⁶ are due to Scholarios' hand.

Fonkitch also argues that cod. *Vatop.* 254 either belonged to the collection of John VI Kantakuzenos' library and formed part of the emperor's donation to the Vatopedi monastery, or belonged to Scholarios, who, as known, visited the monastery in 1456 and probably left the book there.¹⁸⁷ Granted the close connection of Manuel Tzykandyles' scribal activity with Demetrios Kydones and Kantakuzenos,¹⁸⁸ and taking into account that Scholarios possessed a full copy of the *Summa theologiae*, I^a Pars as early as 1431/32 (see *supra*, pp. 151–152), which means that a second copy of this text would not be so useful for him, the former scenario is more probable. If so, then Scholarios' note was probably written during his stay at the Vatopedi monastery.

In par. 5, Scholarios says that he had no access to III^a Pars, either in Latin or Greek. This means that, up to that time, i. e. probably up to 1456, he had no access to the 14th century cod. *Vat. gr.* 1102, which preserves Prochoros Kydones' autograph translation of some of the *quaestiones* of III^a Pars and its *Supplementum*.¹⁸⁹ As I try to show elsewhere,¹⁹⁰ this was most probably due to the fact that, from 1439/45 on, this manuscript was in the hands of Bessarion, who, after Scholarios' joining the anti-unionist camp, interrupted his friendly relationship with him. On the other hand, in the preface to the *Compendia* of the *Summa contra Gentiles* and the *Summa theologiae*, I^a Pars, which, as far as one can say, were written after 1458/59 (see *supra*, pp. 152–154), Scholarios says that he "for a time had access to the entire corpus Thomisticum in its Latin original form".¹⁹¹ Therefore, Scholarios' delighted encounter with a full collection of "Thomas Latinus" (in some place unknown to us) probably postdates 1456 and for sure antedates his compilation of those *Compendia*.

The sources of Scholarios' description of the *Summa theologiae* are two. First, he used Thomas' own Proem to the entire *Summa theologiae* along with the proems to certain of the *quaestiones* of I^a Pars. Further, he used the relevant paragraph (§ 3) from Demetrios Kydones' translation of chs. 53–54 of Bernardus Guidonis' *Legenda S. Thomae*.¹⁹² This source is alluded to in Scholarios' "ὦς φαστ" (§ 4), where he describes the topics of III^a Pars; as he is about to inform the reader in the next paragraph

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Fonkitch 2002, 246: "Ces deux manuscrits apparaissent ... comme deux volumes d'une même édition de la traduction de la *Summa theologiae*, [I^a Pars]. ... Les deux manuscrits constituaient ... un exemplaire de travail du traducteur".

¹⁸⁶ See Tables 5–7 in Fonkitch 2002, 248–250. See also Fonkitch 1983, 11–26.

¹⁸⁷ Fonkitch 2002, 248–249.

¹⁸⁸ See Mondrain 2004b, 249–296; Bianconi 2005, 105–107. Cf. Mondrain 2007, 170–174.

¹⁸⁹ See *supra*, p. 160, n. 173.

¹⁹⁰ J. A. Demetracopoulos 2017a.

¹⁹¹ Ed. Jugie et al., tome V, 2, 2–6.

¹⁹² Ed. J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010f, 851–858. Shortly after (see *supra*, pp. 152–154), Scholarios was to use this translation once more—in the preface to his abridgment of *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Summa Theologiae*, I^a Pars (see J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010f, 847–848).

that he never had access to III^a Pars, the “ώς φασι” implicitly tells the reader that the information provided by Scholarios is indirect. Sometimes, Bernardus himself echoes Thomas' own description of his work; so, it is a tricky task to distinguish between what Scholarios picked up from Thomas and what from Bernardus.

In this edition, I reproduce the paragraph division of Scholarios. I normalize accents, breathings and punctuation as well as add iota subscripts.

Text

1. Ή παρούσα πραγματεία τὸ Πρῶτον τῶν Θεολογικῶν ἔστι τοῦ Θωμᾶ ντὲ Ἀκουίνο τοῦ φιλοσόφου¹⁹³ ἀπὸ τῆς τάξεως τῶν Πρεδικατόρων. «Τὴν» γὰρ «ὅλην θεολογίαν» ἐν τέσσαρσι βιβλίοις ὁ ἀνὴρ οὗτος¹⁹⁴ «συνετάξατο»,¹⁹⁵ ἔργον μηδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐλθόν ποτε εἰς διάνοιαν,¹⁹⁶ μὴ ὅτι γε θαυμασίως οὕτως ἔξεργασθὲν καὶ κρείττον ἡ κατὰ δύναμιν ἀνθρωπίνην μὴ θεόθεν ἀντικρυς βοηθούμενην.¹⁹⁷

2. Τῆς τοιαύτης οὖν πραγματείας θεολογικῆς τῆς εἰς τέσσαρα διαιρουμένης τὸ πρῶτόν ἔστι τὸ παρόν, ἐνῷ «περὶ αὐτῆς τε τῆς θείας διδασκαλίας προηγουμένως διέξεισι»¹⁹⁸ καὶ περὶ τῶν τῷ Θεῷ προσηκόντων ἥτινὶ καὶ ἥ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν προσωπικῶς διακεκριμένων εἴτα περὶ τῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ προόδου τῶν κτισμάτων σκοπεῖ¹⁹⁹ καὶ καθόλου καὶ κατὰ μέρος, οἷον περὶ τῆς σωματικῆς κτίσεως καὶ τῆς ἀσωμάτου καὶ τῆς μικτῆς,²⁰⁰

¹⁹³ τοῦ φιλοσόφου: cf. Scholarios' *Compendium “Summae contra Gentiles” et Primae Partis “Summae theologiae”*: «Ο δὲ τῶν βιβλῶν συγγραφεὺς (...) σοφὸς... καὶ τῶν ἐν σοφίᾳ τελείων ἐν ἀνθρώποις οὐδενὸς ἐνδεής... ὅσοι δέ τοις ἀνήρ...».

¹⁹⁴ Ex cod. οὗτος correxi.

¹⁹⁵ Τὴν (...) ὅλην θεολογίαν (...) συνετάξατο: «...Σύνταγμα τῆς ὅλης θεολογίας» (Demetrios Kydones' translation of chs. 53–54 of Bernardus Guidonis' *Legenda S. Thomae*, ed. J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010f, 851).

¹⁹⁶ ἔργον οὐδενὸς διάνοιαν: «τὸν ἐπιτομώτατον τρόπον ἀγνοούμενον τοῖς πρότερον ἐξένρε καὶ παραδέδωκε» (Demetrios Kydones' translation of chs. 53–54 of Bernardus Guidonis' *Legenda S. Thomae*, ed. J.A. Demetracopoulos, *ibid.*).

¹⁹⁷ κρείττον οὐδενὸς διάνοιαν: «οὐκ ἀνευ θείας χάριτος ιδιως ἐπελθούσης αὐτῷ» (Demetrios Kydones' translation of chs. 53–54 of Bernardus Guidonis' *Legenda S. Thomae*, ed. J.A. Demetracopoulos, *ibid.*).

¹⁹⁸ περὶ οὐδενὸς διέξεισι: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, Ia Pars, Prooemium, tr. Demetrios Kydones: «...πρῶτον ζητήσαι περὶ αὐτῆς τῆς θείας διδασκαλίας...» (cod. Vatop. 254, f. 1v, 2–3 = cod. Coisl. 279, fol. 8v, 6–7).

¹⁹⁹ τῶν τῷ Θεῷ οὐδενὸς σκοπεῖ: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, qu. 2, Prooemium, tr. Demetrios Kydones: «...ἡ περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ θεωρία τριχῇ θεωρεῖται. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ θεωρήσομεν τὰ προσήκοντα τῇ θείᾳ οὐσίᾳ, δεύτερον τὰ τῇ διακρίσει τῶν προσώπων, τρίτον τὰ τῇ παρ' αὐτοῦ τῶν κτισμάτων προόδῳ» (cod. Vatop. 254, fol. 9v, 8–9 = cod. Coisl. 279, fol. 17v, 7–9).

²⁰⁰ καὶ καθόλου οὐδενὸς μικτῆς: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, Ia, qu. 47, Prooemium, tr. Demetrios Kydones: «Μετὰ τὴν εἰς τὸ εἶναι τῶν κτισμάτων πρόοδον περὶ τῆς τούτων διακρίσεως θεωρητέον ἀν εἴη. [...] Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ θεωρήσομεν περὶ τῆς αὐτῶν διακρίσεως κοινῆ, δεύτερον περὶ τῆς

καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτάς καὶ πρὸς ἄλλήλας. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τῷ παρόντι βιβλίῳ θεωρεῖ, ὡς ἐν κεφαλαίῳ περὶ αὐτῶν εἰπεῖν.

3. Ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ²⁰¹ καὶ τρίτῳ «περὶ τῆς κινήσεως διαλαμβάνει, ἥν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἡ λογικὴ κτίσις κινεῖται»²⁰² ἡ δέ ἐστιν ἡ διὰ τῶν ἀρετῶν γε²⁰³ καὶ τῆς ὁρθῆς πολιτείας πρὸς ἐκεῖνον νεῦσις καὶ ὁμοίωσις ἀμηγέπη. Άλλ' ἐν μὲν τῷ πρώτῳ «περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ παθῶν» «καθόλου» ζητεῖ,²⁰⁴ ὃ δὴ καὶ *Πρῶτον τοῦ δευτέρου καλεῖται*,²⁰⁵ ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ περὶ «τῶν αὐτῶν» τούτων «εἰδικῶς θεωρεῖ», ὃ δὴ καὶ *Δεύτερον*²⁰⁶ ἐπιγράφεται τοῦ δευτέρου.²⁰⁷

4. Ἐν δὲ τῷ τετάρτῳ καὶ τελευταίῳ τῆς τοιαύτης πραγματείας²⁰⁸ «περὶ τοῦ» Θεοῦ θεωρεῖ, «ὅς, καθόσον ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὁδός ἐστιν ἡμῖν τῆς ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἀνόδου».²⁰⁹ Ἐν

τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ διακρίσεως, τρίτον περὶ τῆς διακρίσεως τῆς τε σωματικῆς κτίσεως καὶ ἀσωμάτου» (cod. Vatop. 255, fol. 190v, 4–9 = cod. Coisl. 280, fol. 30r, 3–6); qu. 48, Proem: «Ἐφεξῆς θεωρητέον ἂν εἴη περὶ τῆς εἰδικῆς διακρίσεως τῶν ὄντων, καὶ πρῶτον περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ διακρίσεως, μετὰ δὲ τούτῳ περὶ τῆς σωματικῆς κτίσεως καὶ τῆς ἀσωμάτου» (cod. Vatop. 255, fol. 192v, 19–21 = cod. Coisl. 280, fol. 33v, 2–4); qu. 50, Prooemium: «Μετὰ ταῦτα θεωρητέον ἂν εἴη περὶ τῆς σωματικῆς καὶ ἀσωμάτου κτίσεως, καὶ πρῶτον περὶ τῆς καθαρῶς ἀσωμάτου..., μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα περὶ τῆς καθαρῶς σωματικῆς κτίσεως, τρίτον περὶ τῆς συνθέτου ἔκ τε τοῦ σωματικοῦ καὶ ἀσωμάτου κτίσεως...» (cod. Vatop. 255, fol. 199v, 17–21 = cod. Coisl. 280, fol. 44r 6–9).

201 In codice β' legis.

202 Ἐν δὲ usque κινεῖται: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I^a Pars, qu. 2, Prooemium, tr. Demetrios Kydones: «...πρῶτον πραγματευσόμεθα περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, δεύτερον περὶ τῆς κινήσεως, ἥν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ λογικὴ φύσις κινεῖται...» (cod. Vatop. 254, fol. 9v, 5–6 = cod. Coisl. 279, fol. 17v, 4–6).

203 γε is quite unclear.

204 περὶ usque ζητεῖ: «Μετὰ τὴν καθόλου περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ παθῶν... ἐπίσκεψιν...» (Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, II^a II^ae, Prooemium, tr. Demetrios Kydones, cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 1r, 3–4; cf. eds. Leontsinis and Glycophrydi-Leontsini 1976, 27, 7–8).

205 ἐν μὲν usque καλεῖται: «ἐν μὲν τῷ προτέρῳ διορίζεται περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ παθῶν καθόλου· ὃ ἐπιγέγραπται· *Πρῶτον τοῦ δευτέρου*» (ed. J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010f, 852).

206 In codice β' legis.

207 ἐν δὲ usque δευτέρου: «In secundo vero volumine agit et determinat descendendo ad materias virtutum et etiam vitiiorum in speciali; et intitulatur *Secunda secundae*», ὡς τὴν αὐτὴν ὕλην ἔχον τῷ πρὸ αὐτοῦ (852); Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, II^a II^ae, proem, tr. Demetrios Kydones: «...εἰδικῶς περὶ τὰ ἡθικὰ θεωρεῖσθαι.... Ἡ δ' αὐτῇ ἐστιν ὕλη...» (cod. Par. gr. 1237, fol. 1r, 22; cf. eds. G. Leontsinis and A. Glycophrydi-Leontsini 1976, 27, 10–11). No Scholarian word is traceable back to the lines of the Latin text omitted in Demetrios Kydones' translation. This means that Scholarios did not use the original text but only the translation of Guidonis' writing.

208 Ἐν δὲ usque πραγματείας: «Τὸ δέ τρίτον μέρος τοῦ ὅλου θεολογικοῦ συντάγματος τέταρτον ἔστι βιβλίον... ...Καὶ ἐπιγράφεται τοῦτο *Τελευταῖον* μέρος τῆς ὅλης θεολογικῆς πραγματείας» (Demetrios Kydones' translation of chs. 53–54 of Bernardus Guidonis' *Legenda S. Thomae*, ed. J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010f, 852).

209 περὶ usque ἀνόδου: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I^a Pars, qu. 2, Prooemium, tr. Demetrios Kydones: «...τρίτον περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς, καθόσον ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὁδός ἐστιν ἡμῖν τῆς ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἀνόδου» (cod. Vatop. 254, fol. 9v, 6–7 = cod. Coisl. 279, fol. 17v, 6–7).

ῷ καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας οἰκονομίας, ὡς φασι, θαυμασίως διέξεισι καὶ περὶ τῶν μυστηρίων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας²¹⁰ καὶ κοινῶς καὶ ἴδιως.

5. Τούτων τοῖς τρισὶ μόνοις ἡμεῖς ἐνετύχομεν. Τὸ δὲ τέταρτον καὶ τελευταῖον, πολλὰ²¹¹ σπουδάσαντες, οὐκ ἡδυνήθημεν ἰδεῖν οὔτε ἑλληνικῶς (δοκεῖ γὰρ μὴ ἡρμηνεῦσθαι) οὔτε λατινικῶς, ἐπεὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἐνταῦθα Λατίνοις ἡ ὄλιγα ἡ οὐδὲν τῶν τοιούτων κειμηλίων εὑρίσκεται.

6. Ἰστέον μέντοι ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ *Κατὰ τῶν ἔθνικῶν αὐτοῦ πραγματείᾳ* σχεδὸν ἀ κάν τοῖς προρρηθεῖσι τέτταροι βιβλίοις συνετάξατο, εἰ καὶ συνεπτυγμένως καὶ ἔτερόν τινα τρόπον μεταχειρίσεως.²¹²

7. Ἔστι δὲ οὐδὲ παντὶ τῷ βουλομένῳ πρόχειρον τῷ τε παρόντι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῦ ἀνδρὸς πονήμασιν ἐντυγχάνειν, ἀλλὰ μόνοις τοῖς, πρὸς τῷ τὴν ὄλην φιλοσοφίαν ἐπελθεῖν ἱκανῶς, καὶ διὰ τῶν Ἀριστοτελικῶν ὅπαντων βιβλίων ἐλθεῖν καὶ πονεῖν εἰδόσι καὶ δυναμένοις καὶ βουλομένοις.

210 Ἐνῷ usque Ἐκκλησίας: «ἐν αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν μυστηρίων τοῦ Χριστοῦ πραγματεύεται καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ μυστηρίου τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ» (Demetrios Kydones' translation of chs. 53–54 of Bernardus Guidonis' *Legenda S. Thomae*, ed. J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010f, 852).

211 πολλὰ is not so clear in the image used.

212 καὶ ἐν usque μεταχειρίσεως: cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra Gentiles*, Bk. I, ch. 9, tit., par. 5 and 9, tr. Demetrios Kydones: «Περὶ τῆς τάξεως καὶ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ πραγματείᾳ μεταχειρίσεως. (...) ...Πρῶτον ἐπισκεπτέον ἂν εἴη περὶ τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν περὶ Θεοῦ προσηκόντων ζητεῖσθαι, δεύτερον περὶ τῆς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τῶν κτισμάτων προόδου, τρίτον περὶ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν ὕσπερ πρὸς τέλος τάξεως τῶν κτισμάτων. (...) Τὸν προειρημένον τοίνυν τρόπον προχωρεῖν ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ πραγματείᾳ σκοπούντες...» (cod. *Taur. Gr. XIII*, fol. 6r, 7; 27–28; 6r, 38–v, 2; cf. Scholarios' *Compendium «Summae contra Gentiles»*, Bk. I, ch. 9, eds. Jugie et al., tome V, 9, 30); Demetrios Kydones' translation of chs. 53–54 of Bernardus Guidonis' *Legenda S. Thomae*: «Ἐτι συνέθηκεν ἄλλο βιβλίον, ἐπιγραφόμενον *Κατὰ Ἑλλήνων*, εἰς τέσσαρα τμήματα διηρημένον» (ed. J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010f, 852). It seems that Scholarios occasional («Ιστέον μέντοι ὡς...») reference to the *Summa contra Gentiles* was inspired by the fact that, in Guidonis' list, the *Summa contra Gentiles* figures (as № 4) immediately after the *Summa theologiae* («Ἐτι, συνέθηκεν ἄλλο βιβλίον ἐπιγραφόμενον *Κατὰ Ἑλλήνων*, εἰς τέσσαρα τμήματα διηρημένον»; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010f, 852). As Scholarios had obtained a personal copy of Demetrios Kydones' translation of the *Summa contra Gentiles* as early as 1432 (cf. his reproduction of Thomas' phrase «...τρόπου τῆς ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ πραγματείᾳ μεταχειρίσεως»; see the preceding footnote), he could see that its four books correspond thematically with the four parts of the *Summa theologiae*. – Incidentally, Scholarios seems to prefer the title *Κατὰ τῶν ἔθνικῶν* rather than the *Κατὰ Ἑλλήνων* (see the Preface to his abridgment of Demetrios Kydones' translation of the *Summa contra Gentiles*, ed. Jugie et al. 1931, 1, 1–2).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Basil of Caesarea: *Homilia in partem Psalmi XIV, et contra foeneratores*: PG 29, 264D–280C.

Basil of Caesarea: Courtonne Y., *Saint Basile. Homélies sur la richesse. Édition critique et exégétique*, Paris 1935.

Basil of Caesarea, Ps.-: *De misericordia et judicio*, PG 31: 1705–1714.

Cabasilas, Nicholas: *Katà τοκιζόντων*: PG 150: 727–749.

Cabasilas, Nicholas: *Tῇ εύσεβεστάτῃ Αύγουστῃ, περὶ τόκου*: M.-H. Congourdeau and O. Delouis, “*La Supplique à la très pieuse Augusta sur l'intérêt de Nicolas Cabasilas*”, *Travaux et mémoires* 16 (*Mélanges Cécile Morrisson*), 2010, 205–236.

Dionysius the Areopagite, Ps.-: Suchla B.-R., *Corpus dionysiacum. I: Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De divinis nominibus* (Patristische Texte und Studien 33), Berlin and New York 1990.

Gregory Nazianzen: *De pauperum amore*, PG 35: 857A–909C.

Gregory of Nyssa: Gebhardt E., *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, vol. IX/1: *Sermones. Pars I*, Leiden 1967.

John Chrysostom: *De poenitentia*, PG 49: 325–336.

John Chrysostom, Ps.-: *De jejunio et eleemosyna*, PG 48: 1059–1062.

John Chrysostom, Ps.-: *De eleemosyna*, PG 60: 747–752.

Kallistos I, Patriarch: Paidas K., “Μιὰ ἀνέκδοτη Ὄμιλία περὶ δανείου τοῦ πατριάρχη Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Καλλίστου Α'”, in: V.A. Leontaritou, K.A. Bourdara and E. Sp. Papagianni (eds.), *Antecessor. Festschrift für Spyros N. Troianos zum 80. Geburtstag*, Athens 2013, 1247–1262.

Kydones, Demetrios: Leontsinis G. and Glycophrydi-Leontsini A., *Δημητρίου Κυδώνη, Θωμᾶς Ακυνιάτου: Σούμμα θεολογική, ἔξελληνισθεῖσα*, II, 15 [= IIa IIae, qu. 1–16], Athens 1976.

Kydones, Demetrios: Demetracopoulos Ph. A. and Brentanou M., *Δημητρίου Κυδώνη, Θωμᾶς Ακυνιάτου: Σούμμα θεολογική, ἔξελληνισθεῖσα*, II, 17A [= IIa IIae, qu. 23–33], Athens 1980.

Kydones, Demetrios: Kalokairinou E., *Δημητρίου Κυδώνη, Θωμᾶς Ακυνιάτου: Σούμμα θεολογική, ἔξελληνισθεῖσα*, II, 18 [= IIa IIae, qu. 57–79], Athens 2002.

Kydones, Demetrios: Glycofrydi-Leontsini and Spyralatos (2011). *Δημητρίου Κυδώνη, Θωμᾶς Ακυνιάτου: Σούμμα θεολογική, ἔξελληνισθεῖσα*. II, 19 [= IIa IIae, qu. 80–100]. Ed. Glycofrydi-Leontsini, Athanasia and Spyralatos, Ioannis D., Athens.

Kydones, Demetrios: Demetracopoulos J.A., “Demetrios Cydones’ Translation of Bernardus Guidonis’ List of Thomas Aquinas’ Writings and the Historical Roots of Byzantine Thomism”, in: 1308. *Eine Topographische Gleichzeitigkeit* (Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 35), eds. A. Speer and D. Wirmer, Berlin 2010, 827–881.

Scholarios: Mercati G., “Appunti scolariani”, *Bessarione* 24 (1920), pp. 109–143 (= G. Mercati, *Opere minori*, tome IV [Studi e testi 79], Vatican City 1937, pp. 72–106).

Scholarios: Petit L., Sideridès X.A. and Jugie M., *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, tomes I–VIII, Paris 1928–1936.

Scholarios: Demetracopoulos J.A., “Georgios Gennadios II - Scholarios’ *Florilegium Thomisticum II (De fato)* and its anti-Plethonic Tenor”, *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 74/2 (2007), 301–376.

Thomas Aquinas: Busa R., *Sancti Thome Aquinatis opera omnia ut sunt in Indice Thomistico additis 61 scriptis ex aliis Medii Aevi auctoribus*, vol. VII, Stuttgart and Bad Cannstatt 1980.

Thomas Aquinas: *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, ed. R. M. Spiazzi, *S. Thomae Aquinatis Quaestiones quodlibetales. Editio VIII revisa*, Taurini 1949.

Thomas Aquinas: The Fathers of the English Dominican Province, *St. Thomas Aquinas. Summa Theologica. Volume III-Part II, Second Section*, New York 2007 (1912).

Webscapes of the Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus project

<http://www.labarts.upatras.gr/dimitr/index1.html>, University of Patras

<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Hellenic-Institute/Research/Thomas/htm>, University of London

Secondary Sources

Aerts, W. (1986). "Proverbial Passages Taken from Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum Doctrinale* Translated into Medieval Greek: The Methods of Translation Used by the Anonymous Greek Author". In: *Vincent of Beauvais and Alexander the Great*. Ed. by W. J. Aerts, E. R. Smits, and J. Voorbij. Groningen, pp. 141–176.

Athanasiopoulos, P. C. (2015). "Scholarios against Plethon on Philosophy vs. Myth". In: *The Ways of Byzantine Philosophy*. Ed. by M. Knežević. Alhambra, pp. 401–427.

Athanasiopoulos, P. C. (2017a). "Scholarios' *De differentia venialium et mortalium peccatorum* and its Thomistic source". In: *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 75. Forthcoming.

Balcoyannopoulou, I. (2017). "New Evidence on the Manuscript Tradition and on the Latin and Greek Background to George Scholarius' *In De Interpretatione*". In: *Never the Twain Shall Meet?* Ed. by D. Searby. Berlin and Boston, 93–113 in this volume.

Baloglou, C. (1996). "Ἡ οἰκονομικὴ σκέψη τοῦ Νικολάου Καβάσιλα". In: *Βυζαντιακά* 16, pp. 193–213.

Bianconi, D. (2005). "Gregorio Palamas e oltre'. Qualche riflessione su cultura profana, libri e pratiche intellettuali nella controversia palamitica". In: *Medioevo greco* 5, pp. 93–119.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2001b). "Georges Gennadios Scholarios a-t-il été trois fois patriarche de Constantinople?" In: *Byzantion* 71, pp. 60–72.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2008b). *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400 – vers 1472): Un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'empire byzantine*. Archives de l'orient chrétien, 20. Paris.

Cacourous, M. (2000). "Georges Scholarios et le *Paris. gr. 1932*: Jean Chortasménos, l'enseignement de la logique, le thomisme à Byzance". In: *The Greek Script in the 15th and 16th Centuries*. Ed. by S. Patoura-Spanou. National Hellenic Research Foundation. Institute for Byzantine Research. International Symposium, 7. Athens, pp. 397–442.

Cacourous, M. (2010). "Ο Α' τόμος τῶν Ἀπάντων τῶν εύρισκομένων τοῦ Γεωργίου Σχολαρίου: προοιμιακὸ δοκίμιο". In: *Μεταβυζαντινὰ κείμενα. Τόμος 1: Γεννάδιος Σχολάριος, Α'*. Athens, 1*–121*.

Cacourous, M. (2013). "Ε' καὶ Ζ' τόμος τῶν Ἀπάντων τῶν εύρισκομένων τοῦ Γεωργίου Γενναδίου Σχολαρίου. Προοιμιακὸ δοκίμιο". In: *Μεταβυζαντινὰ κείμενα. Τόμος 5: Γεννάδιος Σχολάριος, Ε'*. Athens, 1*–172*.

Cataldi Palau, A. (2008). "Un nuovo manoscritto palinsesto di Giorgio Baiophoros". In: *Studies in Greek Manuscripts*. first published in: S. Lucà (ed.), *Libri palinesti greci: conservazione, restauro digitale, studio Monte Porzio Catone (Villa Mondragone) – Università degli Studi di Roma "Tor Vergata" – Biblioteca del Monumento Nazionale di Grottaferrata. Atti del convegno internazionale 21–24 aprile 2004*, Rome 2008, 263–277. Spoleto, pp. 281–301.

Constas, N. (2002a). "Mark Eugenikos". In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition. II: XIIe–XIXe s.* Ed. by C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello. Turnhout, pp. 411–475.

Corbett, G. (2015). "Peraldus and Aquinas: Two Dominican Approaches to the Seven Capital Vices in the Christian Moral Life". In: *The Thomist* 79, pp. 383–406.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2004a). Ἀπὸ τὴν ἱστορία τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ θωμισμοῦ: Πλήθων καὶ Θωμᾶς Ἀκινάτης. Greek Byzantium and the Latin West: Philosophy – Studies, 2. Athens.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2006a). "Georgios Gemistos-Plethon's Dependence on Thomas Aquinas' *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Summa Theologiae*". In: *Archiv für mittelalterliche Philosophie und Kultur* 12, pp. 276–341.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2010d). "Échos d'Orient – Résonances d'Ouest. In Respect of: C. G. Conticello / V. Conticello (eds.), *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition. II: XIIIe–XIXe s.*" In: *Nicolaus. Rivista di teologia ecumenico-patristica* 37.2, pp. 67–148.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2010f). "Palamas Transformed. Palamite Interpretations of the Distinction between God's 'Essence' and 'Energies' in Late Byzantium". In: *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*. Ed. by M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel. Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales. Bibliotheca, 9. Leuven, pp. 263–372.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2012b). "The Influence of Thomas Aquinas on Late Byzantine Philosophical and Theological Thought: à Propos of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus Project*". In: *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 54, pp. 101–124.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2014b). "Latin Philosophical Works Translated into Greek". In: *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*. Ed. by R. Pasnau and C. van Dyke. 2nd ed. Cambridge, pp. 822–826.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2017a). "A Cultural Aspect of 'Bessario Scholasticus': Bessarion's Self-placement between Hellenes, Greeks and Latins and the Scholastic 'Quaestio' as a Tool for Peacefully Resolving Disagreement". In: *Bessarion's Treasure. Editing, Translating and Interpreting Bessarion's Literary Heritage*. Ed. by S. Mariev. Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica, 3. Forthcoming. Berlin and Boston.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2017b). "George Gennadios II – Scholarios' Abridgment of the *Parva Naturalia*: Its Place in his Œuvre and in the History of Byzantine Aristotelianism". In: *Supplementing the Science of Soul: The "Parva Naturalia" in Greek, Arabic and Latin Aristotelianism. 2014 Conference Gothenburg, 6–8 June*. Ed. by B. Bydén and F. Radović. Studies in the History of Philosophy of Mind, 17. Dordrecht.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2017d). "Philosophy and Christianity in George Scholarios – Gennadios II: An Overview of Certain Central Issues". In: *Φιλοσοφία* (The Academy of Athens) 47. Forthcoming.

Devreesse, R. (1937). *Codices Vaticanini Graeci*. Tomus II: *Codices 330–603*. Vatican City.

Devreesse, R. (1945). *Le fonds Coislin*. Paris.

Dondaine, A. (1948). "Guillaume Peyrat: vie et œuvres". In: *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 18, pp. 162–236.

Ebbesen, S. and J. Pinborg (1981–1982a). "Gennadios and Western Scholasticism. Radulphus Brito's *Ars Vetus* in Greek Translation". In: *Classica et Mediaevalia* 33, pp. 263–319.

Eustratiades, S. and monk Arcadios (1924). *Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἱερᾷ μονῇ Βατοπέδιου ἀποκειμένων κωδίκων*. Paris.

Fonkitch, B. (1983). "Заметки о греческих рукописях советских хранилищ 7. Московский автограф Димитрия Кидониса." In: *Памятники культуры. Новые открытия. 1981*. Leningrad, pp. 11–26.

Fonkitch, B. (2002). "Nouveaux autographes de Démétrius Cydonès et de Génnaide Scholarios". In: *Travaux et mémoires* 14. (Mélanges Gilbert Dagron), pp. 243–250.

Franks, C. A. (2008). "The Usury Prohibition and Natural Law: A Reappraisal". In: *The Thomist* 72.4, pp. 625–660.

Frassinetti, P. (1953). "Il codice Torinese C-2-16 contenente la versione greca della *Summa contra Gentes*, ad opera di Demetrio Cidone". In: *Atti dello VIII Congresso internazionale di studi bizantini* (Palermo, 3–10 aprile 1951). Vol. 1. Rome, pp. 78–85.

Gallagher, D. M. (1999). "Thomas Aquinas on Self-Love as the Basis for Love of Others". In: *Acta Philosophica* 8.1, pp. 23–44.

Gamillscheg, E., D. Harlfinger, and H. Hunger (1989). *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600*, 2A–C. Vienna.

Gómez Pérez, A. R. (1982). *El análisis sobre la usura en la "Suma teológica" de Tomás de Aquino*. Mexico.

Gones, D. B. (1980). *Tὸ συγγραφικὸν ἔργον τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου Καλλίστου Α'*. Athens.

Gordon, B. (1989). *The Economic Problem in Biblical and Patristic Thought*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae IX. Leiden et al.

Harlfinger, D. and J. Harlfinger (1974). *Wasserzeichen aus griechischen Handschriften*. Vol. 1. Berlin.

Inglis, J. (1999). "Aquinas' Replication of the Acquired Moral Virtues". In: *Journal of Religious Ethics* 27.1, pp. 3–27.

Jugie, M. (1930a). "Georges Scholarios et S. Thomas d'Aquin". In: *Mélanges Mandonnet. Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du Moyen Âge*. Vol. 1. Paris, pp. 423–440.

Jugie, M. (1939). "Georges Scholarios, professeur de philosophie". In: *Studi bizantini e neoellenici* 5, pp. 484–494.

Kadas, S. N. (2000). *Τὰ σημειώματα τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς ἱερᾶς μεγίστης μονῆς Βατοπαιδίου*. Karyes.

Karayiannis, A. D. (1994). "The Eastern Christian Fathers (A.D. 350–400) on the Redistribution of Wealth". In: *History of Political Economy* 39, pp. 39–67.

Konstantinou-Rizos, M. (2017). "Prochoros Kydones' Translation of Thomas Aquinas' *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia* and *Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*: Method and Purpose". In: *Never the Twain Shall Meet?* Ed. by D. Searby. Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica, 2, 259–274 in this volume.

Lambros, S. P. (1900). *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*. Vol. 2. Cambridge.

Legrand, É. (1885). *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des grecs au XVe et XVIe siècles*. Vol. 2. Paris.

Mercati, G. (1931b). *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV*. Studi e Testi 56. Vatican City.

Mioni, E. (1981b). *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum codices graeci manuscripti*. Vol. I: *Thesaurus antiquus (codices 1–299)*. Rome.

Mondrain, B. (2004b). "L'ancient empereur Jean VI Cantacuzène et ses copistes". In: *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*. Ed. by A. Rigo. Orientalia Venetiana XVI. Firenze, pp. 249–296.

Mondrain, B. (2007). "Les écritures dans les manuscrits byzantins du XIVe siècle: quelques problématiques". In: *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 44, pp. 157–196.

Mulchahey, M. M. (1998). *Dominican Education before 1350*. Toronto.

Noonan, J. T. (1957). *The Scholastic Analysis of Usury*. Cambridge MA.

Noonan, J. T. (1965). "Tokos and Atokion: An Examination of Natural Law Reasoning against Usury and against Contraception; Note". In: *Natural Law Forum* 10, pp. 215–235.

Oliva, A. (2008–2009). "La Somme de théologie de Thomas d'Aquin: Introduction historique et littéraire". In: *Xύρα. Revue d'études anciennes et médiévales* 7–8, pp. 217–253.

Papadopoulos, S. G. (1967d). *Έλληνικαὶ μεταφράσεις θωμιστικῶν ἔργων. Φιλοθωμισταὶ καὶ ἀντιθωμισταὶ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς βυζαντινῆς θεολογίας*. Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Φιλεκπαιδευτικῆς Ἐταιρείας 47. Athens.

Pérez Marfín, I. (1997b). “*El Libro de Actor*. Una traducción bizantina del *Speculum Doctrinale* de Vincent de Beauvais (Vat. Gr. 12 Y 1144)”. In: *Revue des études byzantines* 55.1, pp. 81–136.

Pilavakis, M. (1987a). “Markos Eugenikos' ‘First Antirrhetic against Manuel Calecas about the Essence and Energy’. Editio Princeps with Introduction and Commentary”. Unpublished. PhD thesis. London: King's College, University of London.

Pino, T. A. (2017). “Hylomorphism East and West: Thomas Aquinas and Mark of Ephesos on the Body-Soul Relationship”. In: *Never the Twain Shall Meet?* Ed. by D. Searby. Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica, 2. Berlin and Boston, 291–307 in this volume.

Podskalsky, G. (1974b). “Die Rezeption der thomistischen Theologie bei Gennadios II. Scholarios (ca. 1403–1472)”. In: *Theologie und Philosophie* 49, pp. 305–323.

Rostagno, E. and N. Festa (1893). “Indice dei codici greci Laurenziani non compresi nel Catalogo del Bandini”. In: *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 1, pp. 131–176.

Schönberger, R. et al. (2011). *Repertorium edierter Texte des Mittelalters aus dem Bereich der Philosophie und angrenzender Gebiete. Band III: M–Z. 2. Völlig überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage*. Berlin.

Spicq, C. (1930). “L'aumône: obligation de justice ou charité?” In: *Mélanges Mandonnet. Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du moyen âge*. Vol. 1. Bibliothèque thomiste XIII. Paris, pp. 245–264.

Steiner, A. (1933). “Guillaume Perrault and Vincent of Beauvais”. In: *Speculum* 8.1, pp. 51–58.

Sternbach, L. (1900–1901). “De Vincentii Bellovacensis excerptis graecis”. In: *Ceské Museum Filologické* 6–7, 6:401–416, 7:1–28.

Taeusch, C. F. (1942). “The Concept of ‘Usury’: The History of an Idea”. In: *Journal of the History of Ideas* 3.3, pp. 291–318.

Tinnefeld, F. (2002a). “Georgios Gennadios Scholarios”. In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition. II: XIIe–XIXe s.* Ed. by C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello. Turnhout, pp. 479–549.

Turner, C. J. G. (1969c). “The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius”. In: *Byzantium* 39, pp. 420–455.

Pantelis Golitssis

ἐσέντζια, ὄντότης, οὐσία

George Scholarios' philosophical understanding of Thomas Aquinas' *De ente et essentia* and his use of Armandus de Bellovisu's commentary

The [...] letter written by Scholarios as a preface to his translation of Armandus' commentary cannot fail to amaze the reader. Even granting the more liberal attitude toward borrowings from other authors which obtained before the age of copyright, Gennadios' statements seem to go beyond the bounds of intellectual honesty. Not only does he assert that he has written the commentary rather than translating it from another's work, but he speaks dismissively of the school of early Thomists, claiming to make no use of them, when the very work he is presenting is a product of this school.¹

1 Scholarios' translation of Thomas' opusculum

Scholarios' translation of *De ente et essentia*, made in 1445,³ exists in two different redactions, preserved in four manuscripts, one of which (*Parisinus Suppl. gr. 618*) is

1 Barbour 1993d, 76.

² On the dating of Armandus' commentary on the *De ente et essentia*, see Glorieux 1934, 96. M.-H. Laurent 1930 had earlier dated the commentary between 1323 and 1328. Stegmüller 1935, 89 n. 23, signals the date 1319 attested in one of the manuscripts that transmit the commentary anonymously (*Angelicus* 104). Nonetheless, Barbour 1993d, 80 n. 194, considers this date as mistaken.

³ See Blanchet 2008d, 318.

an autograph of the author.⁴ A first redaction, actually represented by the *Vaticanus Palatinus gr.* 235, ff. 303r–318r [D], and the *Scorialensis* Y.III.13, ff. 11r–27r [C], apparently copies of a lost autograph, has been reproduced and corrected twice in the actual *Oxoniensis Miscellaneus* 275 (*Auct. T. 5. 13*), ff. 278r–288r [A] and *Parisinus Suppl. Gr.* 618, ff. 9r–19r [B], which give us the definitive redaction. D contains no title.⁵ A title is given to the work in C,⁶ in which Armandus' commentary is subsequently added (ff. 28r–144r); it reads: Θωμᾶς τοῦ Ακίνου περὶ τοῦ εἶναι καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἡ περὶ τοῦ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ τί ἡν εἶναι· ἀπὸ τοῦ λατινικοῦ ἐρμηνευθὲν παρὰ τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου, εἴτα καὶ ἐξηγηθέν. Perhaps surprisingly, the Greek does not render the title “*De ente et essentia*” – which would be, of course, “περὶ τοῦ ὄντος καὶ τῆς οὐσίας” – but gives two different and alternative titles: “περὶ τοῦ εἶναι καὶ τῆς οὐσίας”, that is, “*de esse et essentia*”, and περὶ τοῦ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ τί ἡν εἶναι, that is, “*de ente et quidditate*” or, more plausibly, “*de esse et quidditate*”.⁷ This is actually in accord with the Latin sources, which refer to Thomas' *opusculum* with various titles.⁸ Unfortunately, the first folio is missing in B, i. e. Scholarios' autograph, but ms. A, which contains the text without the commentary, renders in Greek the title which Scholarios apparently found more fitting to the contents of Thomas' text: Τοῦ Θωμᾶς, περὶ διαφορᾶς οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐρμηνευθὲν καὶ πρὸς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετενεχθὲν γλῶτταν παρὰ γεωργίου τοῦ σχολαρίου (“Of Thomas, on the difference between essence and being translated, that is transferred to the Greek language, by George Scholarios”). Indeed, out of seven chapters that compose Thomas' work in Sestili's edition followed by Martin Jugie, only the first deals with the *ens*, so as to establish that the *essentia*, with which the rest of the work deals, is derived from the predicative *ens* (and not from the veridical *ens*), whereas the *esse* conditions Thomas' analysis of the essence of immaterial substances in chapters 5 and 6. The title of the work, as formulated by Scholarios, suggests that he already had a good understanding of Thomas' *opusculum*.

It is perhaps interesting to note that one of the corrections made by Scholarios, when passing from the first to the second redaction, was to rewrite the word

⁴ See Petit, Sideridès, and Jugie 1933, 154. The editors considered erroneously that all four manuscripts were autographs of Scholarios.

⁵ A librarian has added (f. 303r) the title “*Thomae Aquinatis opusculum De ente et essentia*”. He first wrote in the margin “*Logicum fragmentum in quo potissimum de substantiis*”, apparently before he identified the text as Thomas' *De ente et essentia*.

⁶ The folio that contained the beginning of the text in B is missing.

⁷ Scholarios says that “*esse*” in Latin is used with the sense of both “εἶναι” and “ὄν”; cf. Schol., *CDEE*, p. 219.6–7: ...ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔσσε, ὁ παρ' αὐτοῖς [sc. τοῖς Λατίνοις] σημαίνει τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ ὄν.

⁸ Bartholomew of Lucca (1236–1327) refers to the work both as *De ente et essentia* and as *De quidditate et esse*, whereas Bernard Guido (1261–1331) refers to it as *De quidditate entium seu de ente et essentia*. The manuscripts Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 6512, ff. 132–135, of the fourteenth century, Bibliothèque de l'Université, cod. 209, ff. 211–227, and Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, cod. 337, ff. 124–125, both of the fifteenth century, transmit the work under the title *De esse et essentia*; see Roland-Gosselin O.P. 1926, p. XV n. 1 and p. XXIX.

“ἐσέντζια”, which corresponds to the spoken Latin as a Greek would speak it (*esencia*, with one σ, instead of *essencia*), as ἐσσέντια in proper classical Latin (*essentia*).⁹ The most important difference, however, between the first and the second redaction is the translation of “quid(d)itas”. Whereas it appears in the first redaction as “όντότης” or “ὕπαρξις” (Scholarios uses at times both together, ή ὄντότης ή ὕπαρξις, in order to render the single word “quiditas”),¹⁰ it is regularly corrected to οὐσία,¹¹ but also once to εἶδος,¹² in the second and definitive redaction. To give an example, the ὕπαρξις or the ὄντότης of a man or a woman, according to the first redaction, is her animality, rationality and mortality, i. e. her ζωότης, λογικότης καὶ θνητότης. It definitely sounds strange in Modern Greek to say “η ὑπαρξή ή η οντότητα ενός ανθρώπου είναι η ζωότητα καὶ η λογικότητά του” but it was not quite so in Byzantine Greek.

In book *Kappa* of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* the expression ὑπάρχον καὶ ὅν is used to describe the object (γένος) of sciences other than the first science, that is, wisdom.¹³ According to Michael of Ephesus' commentary on *Kappa*, ὑπάρχον καὶ ὅν is the object of science that stands between ὅν ή ὄντες, the being as non-existent, for which there is no science at all, and ὅν ή ὅν, the being *qua* being which is the object of first philosophy; in other words, ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ὅντα are the accidents that are studied *per se*, e. g. the magnitudes that are studied by geometry.¹⁴ “The first philosophy”, says Michael, “studies the being *qua* being, that is, not insofar as it has weight or heat or

⁹ Cf. Schol., *DEE*, ad 157.20.

¹⁰ Cf. Schol., *DEE*, p. 155.32–35: τὸ τῆς οὐσίας ὄνομα παρὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τῆς ὄντότητος ή ὑπάρξεως μεταλαμβάνεται, καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὁ συνεχῶς ὁ Φιλόσοφος ὄνομάζει τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι, τουτέστι τὸ δι'οὗ τὶ ἔχει τὸ εἶναι (*nomen essentiae a philosophis in nomen quidditatis mutatur; et hoc est quod Philosophus frequenter nominat "quod quid erat esse"*, *id est hoc per quod aliquid habet esse quid*); p. 156.9–10: Τὸ μὲν οὖν τῆς ὄντότητος ὄνομα εἴτουν ὑπάρξεως λαμβάνεται ἐκ τοῦ δηλοῦνθαι δι' ὄρισμοῦ (*Quidditatis vero nomen sumitur ex hoc quod per definitionem significatur*); ad 167.27–28: “Οθεν Ἀβινσένας φησὶν ὅτι ή ὄντότης ή ὕπαρξις αὐτῷ τοῦ ἀπλοῦ ἔστιν αὐτὸ τὸ ἀπλοῦν, διότι οὐκ ἔστι τι τὸ ταύτην δεχόμενον (*Unde Avicenna dicit quod quidditas simplicis est ipsummet simplex, quia non est aliquid aliud recipiens ipsam*).

¹¹ Cf. Schol., *DEE*, ad 167.23, 167.27, 168.6, 168.13, 168.34, 170.23, 172.22, 172.23, 172.24, 172.26. In p. 168.9–10 πᾶσα δὲ οὐσία ή ὕπαρξις δύναται νοεῖσθαι χωρὶς τοῦ νοεῖσθαι τι περὶ τοῦ εἶναι αὐτῆς (*Omnis autem essentia vel quidditas potest intelligi sine hoc quod aliquid intelligatur de esse suo*) is reduced to πᾶσα δὲ οὐσία δύναται νοεῖσθαι...

¹² Cf. Schol., *DEE*, p. 169.20: τὸ εἶδος ή ή οὐσία αὐτῆς [sc. τῆς νοήσεως] ἔστιν αὐτὸ ὅπερ ἔστιν (*quidditas vel essentia eius* [sc. intelligentiae] *est ipsum quod est ipsa*). More expectedly (in light of the first passage quoted in n. 10), the Aristotelian term τί ἦν εἶναι, too, is used for *quidditas* in the second redaction; cf. Scholarios, *DEE*, ad 167.2, 167.14, 168.6 and 172.2.

¹³ Aristot., *Metaph.*, XI 7, 1063b 36–1064a 4: Πᾶσα δ' ἐπιστήμη ζητεῖ τινὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ αἰτίας περὶ ἔκαστον τῶν ὑφ' αὐτὴν ἐπιστητῶν, δίον ιατρικὴ καὶ γυμναστικὴ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἔκάστη τῶν ποιητικῶν καὶ μαθηματικῶν. ἔκαστη γὰρ τούτων περιγραψαμένη τι γένος αὐτῇ περὶ τοῦτο πραγματεύεται ὡς ὑπάρχον καὶ ὅν, οὐχ ή δὲ ὅν, ἀλλ' ἔτερα τις αὕτη παρὰ ταύτας τὰς ἐπιστήμας ἔστιν ἐπιστήμη.

¹⁴ Mich., *In Metaph.*, p. 659.30–35: τοῦ δὲ “ἔκαστη γὰρ τούτων περιγραψαμένη τι γένος αὐτῇ περὶ τοῦτο πραγματεύεται ὡς ὑπάρχον καὶ ὅν” τὸ ὡς ὑπάρχον καὶ ὅν οὐ τοῦτο φησὶν ὅτι ὁ περιεγράψατο καὶ ἔλαβεν οἷον ή γεωμετρία ή ὅν τοῦτο σκοπεῖ, ἀλλὰ λέγοι ὃν ὅτι ὁ περιεγράψατο ὡς ὑπάρχον λαβοῦσα

anything else among the sensible contrarieties, but only insofar as it is being and participates in ὄντότης and ὑπάρξις¹⁵. The ὃν ή ὅν (and not the ὃν ή ποσόν, the ὃν ή ποιόν etc.) is that which participates in ὄντότης primarily, in other words whatever belongs to the first category of οὐσία, whereas the other nine categories are said to participate in ὄντότης secondarily (μετέχουσι γάρ ὄντότητος καὶ εἰσιν ἐν ὑπάρξει ... ἀλλὰ πρώτως μὲν ή οὐσία, δευτέρως δὲ καὶ οἱ λοιπαὶ ἐννέα κατηγορίαι)¹⁶. ὄντότης without qualification is the “one with reference to which” (τὸ πρὸς ἐν) the ten categories are said, which signify “beings” (ὄντα) neither synonymously nor homonymously:

- x ὃν ἔστι (where x is “man”, “ox” etc.) = x ὄντότητος μετέχει πρώτως = x ἐν ὑπάρξει ἔστι πρώτως (i. e. x exists as a subject)¹⁷
- x ὃν ἔστι (where x is “dumb”, “three cubits tall” etc.) = x ὄντότητος μετέχει δευτέρως = x ἐν ὑπάρξει ἔστι δευτέρως (i. e. x exists in a subject)

Michael’s elder fellow Eustratius, Metropolitan of Nicaea, similarly says in his commentary on the second book of Aristotle’s *Posterior Analytics* that ὄντότης is not applicable absolutely (ἀπλῶς) to what is ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ καὶ περὶ αὐτήν, i. e. the rest of the categories, but only to the category of οὐσία, which is ὃν ἀπλῶς.¹⁸ Eustratius uses, however, ὄντότης in a further, more “metaphysical” sense, which pertains to the def-

καὶ ὄντότητος μετέχον, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὡς ὄντης μετέχει τὰ τούτων συμβεβηκότα καθ’ αὐτό, ή δὲ πρώτη φιλοσοφία η̄ ὄντα αὐτὰ θεωρεῖ.

¹⁵ Mich., *In Metaph.*, p. 642.1-4: ἡ πρώτη φιλοσοφία του ὄντος η̄ ὅν ἔστι θεωρητική (οὐ γάρ η̄ βαρύτητα ἔχει η̄ καθὸ θερμότητα η̄ ἄλλην τινὰ των αἰσθητῶν ἐναντιώσεων τοῦτο θεωρεῖ, ἀλλ’ η̄ μόνον ὅν ἔστι καὶ ὄντότητος καὶ ὑπάρξεως μετέχει).

¹⁶ Mich., *In Metaph.*, p. 641.23-29: αἱ οὖν δέκα κατηγορίαι ὡν τὸ ὅν κατηγορεῖται οὕτε συνώνυμοί εἰσιν (αἱ αὐταὶ γάρ ὃν ἂν ήσαν καὶ οὐκ ἀν διέφερεν η̄ οὐσία τοῦ ποσοῦ οὕτε αὖ τὸ ποσὸν τῆς οὐσίας, οὔδε αἱ λοιπαὶ ἀλλήλων). ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ ὄμωνύμως αὐτῶν τὸ ὅν κατηγορεῖται μετέχουσι γάρ ὄντότητος καὶ εἰσιν ἐν ὑπάρξει καὶ τῆς τοῦ ὄντος οὐ πάντῃ ἔστερηνται φύσεως, ἀλλ’ οὐ πρώτως, ἀλλὰ πρώτως μὲν ή οὐσία, δευτέρως δὲ καὶ οἱ λοιπαὶ ἐννέα κατηγορίαι).

¹⁷ This is also true for the rational soul; e. g. Socrates’ soul is said to be ἐν ὑπάρξει and to participate in ὄντότης. It exists, however, in a body; cf. Mich., *In Metaph.*, p. 724.31-725.2: ἀνάγκη, εἴπερ εἰσὶ τὰ μαθηματικὰ οὐσίαι τινὲς καὶ φύσεις καὶ ἐνεργεία ἀλλὰ μὴ δυνάμει, η̄ ἐν τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς εἶναι ὕσπερ τινὲς τῶν Πυθαγορέων λέγουσι (λέγουσι γάρ τινες τούτων ὅτι ὕσπερ η̄ λογικὴ ψυχή, οἷον φέρε τοῦ Σωκράτους η̄ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, εἰ καὶ ἐν ὑπάρξει ἔστι καὶ ὄντότητος μετέχει καὶ καθ’ αὐτήν ἔστιν, ὅμως ἐν σώματι ἔστιν, η̄ μὲν οὐρανία τοῦ παντός, η̄ δὲ τοῦ Σωκράτους ἐν τῷ τοῦ Σωκράτους σώματι, οὕτω καὶ τὰ μαθηματικά ἐνεργεία καὶ καθ’ αὐτὰ ὄντα ἐν τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς εἰσιν) η̄ οὖν ἐν τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς εἰσι τὰ μαθηματικά, η̄ οὐκ ἐν τούτοις ἀλλὰ καθ’ αὐτά, ἐν τινι μὴ ὄντα, ὕσπερ οὐδὲ αἱ ἀσώματοι καὶ ἀκίνητοι καὶ θεῖαι οὐσίαι.

¹⁸ Cf. Eustrat., *In Anal. Post.*, p. 20.1-8: ὕσπερ τὴν μὲν οὐσίαν ἀπλῶς λέγομεν ὅν, τὸ δὲ λευκόν καὶ τὸ τρέχειν καὶ καθόλου ὄσα ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ καὶ περὶ αὐτήν πη̄ καὶ τινὰ ὄντα, ὡς μὴ ἀρμοττούσης αὐτοῖς ἀπλῶς τῆς ὄντότητος, ἀλλ’ η̄ μόνον διὰ τὸ εἶναι τι τοῦ ὄντος αὐτά, οἷον ποιότητας, ποσότητας, πηλικότητας, ἐνεργείας, πάθη, ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτον, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὅταν ζητῶμεν περὶ τινος τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ, τότε οὐχ ἀπλῶς ζητοῦμεν περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ’ ἐν μέρει.

inition of a thing. He switches from the ὄντότης in which a thing participates (and this properly allows explaining the ontological status of the accidents) to the ὄντότης of a thing. The ὄντότητες τῶν πραγμάτων *per se*, he says, are not made known by the names, which only reveal accidental ὄντότητες (e. g., as the names ἄνθρωπος, μέροψ and βροτός make known that man raises his eyes, articulates his voice and is mortal), but by the unique proper definitions of things, i. e. the definitions that include their genus and their specific differences; e. g. the ὄντότης of man is not ζῶν πεζὸν δίπουν, nor ζῶν ἄπτερον ὑπόπουν δίπουν but ζῶν λογικὸν θνητόν.¹⁹ ὄντότης (or ὑπαρξίς) refers to what a being (ὄν, e. g. ἄνθρωπος) is by definition: a human being's ψύχη, λογικότης and θνητότης constitute its ὄντότης.²⁰ This captures well the meaning of the Latin “quidditas” and it is apparently through his acquaintance with the commentaries of Michael of Ephesus and of Eustratius of Nicaea that Scholarios translated the Latin term as ὄντότης or ὑπαρξίς:

¹⁹ Cf. Eustrat., *In Anal. Post.*, p. 102.32–103.21: εἰ γάρ ἦν καθ' αὐτὸ σημαντικὸν τοῦ ὄντος τὸ ὄνομα, ὥσπερ δὴ καὶ ὁ ὄρισμός, οὐκ ἀν καὶ μὴ οὖσιν ὄνόματα ἐτέθειτο οὐδὲ ἀν πολλὰ τῷ αὐτῷ ὄνόματα ἔκειτο, οὐδὲ μὴν πολλοῖς πράγμασιν ὄνομα τὸ αὐτό. νῦν δὲ ὄρισμός μὲν τοῦ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς καὶ οὐ πολλοί (εἰ γάρ καὶ διάφοροι ἐνίστε λόγοι τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀποδίδονται, ἀλλ' εἰς ἐκάστου ὁ κυρίως ὄρισμός, ὃς τῷ γένει τῶν εἰδητικῶν συνερχομένων διαφορῶν ἀπό τελεῖται, ἐπεὶ καὶ φύσις μία καὶ εἶδος ἐν τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου δηλούμενον), ὄνόματα δὲ πολλὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἴναι ἐνδέχεται ἀπό τινων μὲν παρεπομένων αὐτῷ τιθέμενα, ἐπίσης δὲ ἀλλήλοις δηλοῦντα τὸ ὑποκείμενον τοῖς συνήθως ἔχουσι τῶν ὄνομάτων. ἄνθρωπος γάρ καὶ μέροψ καὶ βροτός τὸ αὐτό, τὸ μὲν ὅτι ἀνώ ἀθρεῖ τὸν ὄπα, τὸ δ' ὅτι μερίζει τὴν ὄπα, τὸ δ' ὅτι φθαρτός ἐστι, καὶ ἔξ ἄλλων ἀν τις ἵσως ἐπομένων αὐτῷ εὐρήσει κείμενα ὄνόματα· ὄρισμός δ' ὁ κυρίως εἰς, τὸ γάρ ζῶν πεζὸν δίπουν ἐπεὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑλικῶν σύγκειται, οὐ κυρίως, καὶ τὸ ζῶν ἄπτερον ὑπόπουν δίπουν ὡσαύτως· τὸ δὲ ζῶν λογικὸν θνητόν ἐπεὶ τὰς εἰδητικὰς ἔχει διαφοράς, κυρίως ἐστὶν ὄρισμός. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὄρισμός ὁ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἀν ποτε τεθεί τοῖς διαφόροις κατ' εἶδος, ὄνομα δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πολλάκις τοῖς κατ' εἶδος διεστηκόσιν, ὡς κύων κατ' εἶδος ἔτερος ὁ ἀστήρ καὶ ὁ χερσαῖς καὶ ὁ θαλάττιος, ὅπερ οὐκ ἀν ἦν, εἰ καθ' αὐτὸ τὰ ὄνόματα ὥσπερ οἱ ὄρισμοὶ ἐδήλουν τὰ πράγματα. καὶ μεταθείη ἀν τις τὸ τοῦδε εἰς ἔτερον ὄνομα, ὄρισμὸν δ' οὐχί. καὶ ἐκ τῆς τῶν ὄνομάτων δὲ ἐτυμότητος καταμάθοι ἀν τις ὡς κατὰ συμβεβηκός δηλοῦσι τὰς τῶν πραγμάτων ὄντότητας· ἐκ γάρ τῶν παρεπομένων ταῖς φύσεσι λαμβανόμενα ἔξ ἐκείνων τε τὰς ἐτυμότητας δέχεται, καὶ ἐκεῖνα καθ' αὐτὸ δηλοῦν ἐπαγγέλλεται. ἐπεὶ οὖν καθ' αὐτὸ τοῖς ὄρισμοῖς τῶν πραγμάτων ἡ δήλωσις, κατὰ συμβεβηκός δὲ τοῖς ὄνόμασι, καὶ τῶν ὄντων ἔξ ἀνάγκης οἱ ὄρισμοί, ὄνόματα δὲ καὶ μὴ ὄντων ἐστί, καὶ ἀμετάθετοι μὲν οἱ ὄρισμοί, μετατίθενται δὲ τὰ ὄνόματα, καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦθ' ἔτερα, πᾶς οὐκ ἄτοπον ισοδυναμεῖν λέγειν ἀπλῶς τοῖς ὄρισμοῖς τὰ ὄνόματα; κἄν ὄρισμός δὲ ῥθείη τὸ ὄνομα, οὕτως ἀν λέγοιτο ὡς κατὰ συμβεβηκός δηλοῦν τὸ αὐτὸ ὅπερ ὁ ὄρισμός καθ' αὐτό. Note that in *In Anal. Post.*, 179.4–5, and in *In Eth. Nic.*, 294.21, Eustratius contradistinguishes ὄντότης (which is practically the equivalent of a Platonic Idea) and γένεσις. Cf. also Eustratius' “more theological” (θεολογικώτερον) interpretation in *In Anal. Post.*, 215.7–9: τῇ μὲν οὖν δημιουργικῇ γνώσει ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων ὄντότης ἔπειται, διὸ καὶ τῷ θελῆσαι μόνον παράγειν τα πάντα ὁ δημιουργὸς λέγεται, τῇ δὲ καθ' ήμᾶς γνώσει τὸ ὄριζεσθαι. We are able to define things because we know things.

²⁰ Cf. Schol., *DEE*, p. 158.19–20: Ὁ Σωκράτης οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἡ ψύχη καὶ λογικότης, ἡ εἰσὶν ἡ ὄντότης εἴτουν ἡ ὑπαρξίς αὐτοῦ.

Now, the name of ὄντότης or ὑπάρξις is taken from its [i. e. ὄντότης' or ὑπάρξις'] being made known through definition, whereas the οὐσία is said insofar as it is through it and in it that the ὁν [i. e. whatever is divided in ten categories] has its being [one of the ten categories].²¹

In contrast with *quidditas* or ὄντότης, which properly refers to what a thing is by definition, *essentia* or οὐσία may refer to two things: (a) to that in virtue of which a being, say a human being, has its being ἀνθρωπος;²² in other words it refers not to a human being's ζωή, λογικότης and θνητότης but to a human being's ἀνθρωπότης, which is called its essence *per modum partis* (ώς μέρος), meaning that ἀνθρωπότης excludes the designated matter that each individual human being has; it is in virtue of this exclusion that we can truly say that the οὐσία of Socrates is not Socrates but his "humanity"; (b) to the compound of matter and form, in virtue of which we can truly say that Socrates is an οὐσία; this is the essence *ut totum* (ώς ὅλον), which includes the matter of a composite thing.²³ Whereas the *quidditas* is a substitute for essence in the first sense (the *essentia ut pars* of a composite thing is its *quidditas*, when expressed through a definition [*humanitas = animalitas + rationalitas + mortalitas*]), it cannot be used for the essence in the second sense. To put it differently, whereas we can truly say "ἀνθρωπος οὐσία ἔστι", we cannot truly say "ἀνθρωπος ὄντότης ἔστι". Does the fact that in the second redaction Scholarios modified ὄντότης to οὐσία means he failed to notice this subtle distinction? It does not seem so.

Scholarios' corrections of ὄντότης (or ὑπάρξις) to οὐσία (or τί ἦν εἶναι) appear in the second part of the treatise, in which the simple, immaterial substances are discussed. Whereas the *quidditas* or *essentia* of a human being is not the human being itself, the *quidditas* or *essentia* of an immaterial spiritual substance is the spiritual substance itself.²⁴ There is a difference between Socrates (which includes Socrates' matter) and the essence of Socrates (that part of Socrates in virtue of which Socrates is a human being), but there is no distinction between Gabriel and the essence of Gabriel. (This might be more easily grasped, if we consider, e. g., the Pythagorean theorem: there is no difference between the Pythagorean theorem and what the Pythagorean

21 Schol., *DEE*, p. 156.9–11: Τὸ μὲν οὖν τῆς ὄντότητος ὄνομα εἴτονυ ὑπάρξεως λαμβάνεται ἐκ τοῦ δηλοῦνθα δι' ὀρισμοῦ, ἡ δὲ οὐσία λέγεται καθὸ δι' αὐτῆς καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τὸ ὄν ἔχει τὸ εἶναι (= Thomas, *DEE*, p. 12.7–9: *Quidditatis vero nomen sumitur ex hoc quod per definitionem significatur; sed essentia dicitur secundum quod per eam et in ea ens habet esse*; cf. Avicenna, *Log.*, p. I, f. 3v b: *Dicimus quod omne quod est essentiam habet qua est id quod est, et qua est eius necessitas, et qua est eius esse*).

22 Cf. Schol., *DEE*, p. 161.36–162.2: ἡ ἀνθρωπότης ἐγκλείει τῇ ἑαυτῆς ἐννοίᾳ μόνον ἐκεῖνα ἔξ ὧν ὁ ἀνθρωπος ἔχει τὸ εἶναι ἀνθρωπος.

23 Cf. Schol., *DEE*, p. 162.31–34: τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο ἡ ἀνθρωπότης' σημαίνει ταύτην [sc. τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] ώς μέρος, καθόσον οὐ περιέχει ἐν τῇ ἑαυτῆς σημασίᾳ εἰ μη ὅπερ ἔστι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθόσον ἔστιν ἀνθρωπος, καὶ ἀποκόπτει πᾶσαν ἐπισημασίαν τῆς ὑλῆς' ὅθεν κατὰ τῶν ἀτόμων οὐ κατηγορεῖται.

24 Cf. Schol., *DEE*, p. 169.19–22: ἡ οὐσία τῆς νοήσεως ἔστιν αὐτὴ ἡ νόησις, διὰ τοῦτο τὸ εἶδος ἡ ἡ οὐσία αὐτῆς ἔστιν αὐτὸ διπερ ἔστιν, καὶ τὸ εἶναι αὐτῆς, τὸ ἐκ Θεοῦ προσειλημμένον, ἔστι τὸ ὃ ἔστιν ἡ ὑφέστηκεν ἐν τῇ τῶν πραγμάτων φύσει.

theorem is.) This is the reason for which immaterial substances, in opposition to material substances, are unique both specifically and numerically. Whereas it is not true that the form of Socrates is Socrates, or that Socrates is his *humanitas*, it is true that the form of Gabriel is Gabriel and that Gabriel is *Gabrielitas*. Thus, form, quiddity and essence can be used interchangeably when speaking of immaterial substances. This justifies, I think, Scholarios in his final choice to render “quidditas” once as εἶδος²⁵ and to generally subsume ὄντότης or ὑπάρξις under οὐσία, so as to avoid using different words that refer to the same thing. This is how a characteristic passage appears in the first and the second redaction:

“Οθεν φησὶν Αβινσένας ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τοῦ Περὶ ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ βιβλίῳ, ὅτι τὸ εἶδος (*forma*) ἐν τοῖς συνθέτοις πράγμασιν ἔξι ὥλης καὶ εἴδους “ἔστι διαφορὰ ἀπλῆ τοῦ ἐκ ταύτης συνισταμένου”, οὐ μέντοι γε οὕτως, ὥστε αὐτὸ τὸ εἶδος εἶναι διαφοράν, ἀλλ’ ὅτι ἔστιν ἀρχὴ διαφορᾶς, ὡς ὁ αὐτός φησιν ἐν τῇ Μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ λέγεται ἡ τοιαύτη διαφορὰ διαφορὰ εἶναι ἀπλῆ διὰ τὸ λαμβάνεσθαι ἔξι ἐκείνου ὅπερ ἔστι μέρος τῆς ὑπάρξεως/οὐσίας (*quidditatis*) τοῦ πράγματος, δηλονότι τοῦ εἰδους. Διότι δὲ αἱ ἄλλοι οὐσίαι (*substantiae*) εἰσὶν ὑπάρξεις ἀπλῶς/οὐσίαι ἀπλαῖς (*simplices quidditates*), οὐ δύναται λαμβάνεσθαι ἐν αὐταῖς ἡ διαφορὰ παρ’ ἐκείνου ὅπερ ἔστι μέρος τῆς ὑπάρξεως/οὐσίας (*pars quidditatis*), ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπάρξεως/οὐσίας ὅλης (*a tota quidditate*).· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ Περὶ ψυχῆς φησὶν Αβινσένας, ὅτι “διαφορὰν ἀπλῆν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, εἰ μὴ τὰ εἶδη (*species*) ὃν οἱ ὑπάρξεις/οὐσίαι (*essentiae*) σύνθετοι εἰσὶν ἔξι ὥλης καὶ εἴδους”. Όμοιως δὲ καὶ ἐν αὐταῖς ἔξι ὅλης τῆς οὐσίας (*ex tota essentia*) λαμβάνεται τὸ γένος, διαφόρω μέντοι γε τρόπῳ.

This is why Avicenna says in the first book of his *On the Soul* that the form in things composed of matter and form “is a simple difference of what this difference constitutes”, not of course in the sense that the form itself is a difference,²⁶ but in the sense that the form is a principle of difference,²⁷ as Avicenna says in his *Metaphysics*. And we say that such a difference is a simple difference because it is taken from what is part of the ὑπάρξις/οὐσία of the thing,²⁸ namely its form. Since, however, the immaterial οὐσίαι are simple ὑπάρξεις/οὐσίαι, it is not possible for their difference²⁹ to be taken from what is part of the ὑπάρξις/οὐσία, but it is taken from the whole ὑπάρξις/οὐσία; and for this reason Avicenna says in the beginning of his *On the Soul* that “there is no simple difference except for forms [i. e. species] whose ὑπάρξεις/οὐσίαι are composed of matter and form”. Similarly, their genus [i. e. their immateriality or intellectuality] is taken from the whole οὐσία but of course in a way different [from that of the composite things, the genus of which is taken from their matter].³⁰

Both in the first and in the second redaction Scholarios uses a single term so as to avoid confusing his reader. Even “essentiae” in the second quote of Avicenna was rendered at first not as “οὐσίαι” but as “ὑπάρξεις”. His decision to ultimately use “οὐσία”

²⁵ See above n. 12.

²⁶ This is true only for immaterial substances.

²⁷ E. g. humanity is a principle of rationality.

²⁸ This thing is composite: it also includes the genus that corresponds to its matter.

²⁹ Their difference is constituted by their degree of perfection depending on how close they are to God: the more close they are to God, the less potentiality they have and the more energies they are.

³⁰ Schol., *DEE*, p. 172.16–28.

for all cases may be explained as a wish to stress the perfect coincidence of essence and quiddity in the case of immaterial substances (whereas the *essentia* may not be the *quidditas* in material substances). A weak point in Scholarios' translation (apart from his rendering "species" as "εἶδη" for which he had actually no alternative) is his translation of "substantiae" as "ούσιαι" in both redactions. Nonetheless, there is an explanation for that in chapter 34 of the commentary (λδ'. Ὄτι τὸ τῆς οὐσίας ὄνομα παρὰ μὲν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ὁμώνυμόν ἐστιν, παρὰ δὲ Λατίνοις ἐκάστη τῆς οὐσίας σημασία ίδιαν ἔχει προσηγορίαν [That the name ούσια in Greek authors is homonymous, whereas in Latin authors each sense of ούσια has its proper word]):

Therefore, in the language of the Latins the discourse about these things is clear, since there are two names for two things [i. e. *substantia* and *essentia*]. On the contrary, it is somehow unclear when it is translated in our language, since each of the two senses of ούσια [i. e. (i) the subject (τὸ ὑποκείμενον) of which each of the ten categories is predicated and (ii) the formal cause of being something (ἥ ἐστιν ἔκαστον)] is signified by the same word, as here: ἡ τῶν συνθέτων ούσια; it would have been possible to say, translating according to the Greeks, ἡ τῶν συνθέτων φύσεων ούσια. But this, too, would have been unclear according to Latin [authors]; for they call φύσις the form and the essence which signifies the form.³¹

Both here and in the passage quoted before, Scholarios avoided rendering *substantia* as φύσις, since this would betray the meaning of the word "natura" in Latin.

2 Scholarios' "translation" of Armandus' commentary

We have already reached Scholarios' commentary or, as Barbour would put it, Scholarios' translation of Armandus' commentary on the *De ente et essentia*. Chapter 34, however, of which I have only quoted a short passage, is an original reflection by Scholarios, left unnoticed by Barbour, upon the ambiguity of the word "ούσια" in Greek and the word "natura" in Latin and, consequently, upon the difficulties encountered by the translator from Latin into Greek and from Greek into Latin. I do not agree that Scholarios' work on Armandus' commentary can be properly called a translation, at least if this is what his ἀπὸ τοῦ λατινικοῦ ἐρμηνεία of Thomas' *De ente et essentia* is. It would be better described as an adaptation of an early Thomistic commentary from the

³¹ Schol., CDEE, p. 219.12–19: Ἐν μὲν οὖν τῷ τῶν Λατίνων ίδιώματι σαφής ἐστιν ὁ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων λόγος, ἀτε δυσὶ πράγμασι διττῶν κειμένων τῶν ὀνομάτων· ἀσαφῆς δέ πως ἐστὶν εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν μεταβαλλόμενος διὰ τὸ ἐκατέραν ἐκδοχὴν τῆς οὐσίας ὑπὸ μιᾷ προσηγορίᾳ σημαίνεσθαι, ὥσπερ ἐνταῦθα "ἡ τῶν συνθέτων ούσιων ούσια", εἴπε δ' ἀν τις καθ' Ἑλληνας μεταβαλών, "ἡ τῶν συνθέτων φύσεων ούσια". Άλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο κατὰ Λατίνους ἦν ἀσαφές· φύσιν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι μάλιστα τὸ εἶδος καλοῦσιν καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν τὴν τὸ εἶδος σημαίνουσαν.

point of view of a Palamite Greek. Scholarios has written by himself most of chapter 93 (Εἰ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ λόγου σύνθεσις [*Whether in God there is a composition of reason*]), where it is question of God's absolute simplicity,³² as it relates to composite propositions such as “ὁ Θεὸς ἀγαθός ἔστι”, “ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθῆς ἔστι”, “ὁ Θεὸς ἔστιν”, “ὁ Θεὸς νοεῖ”, “ὁ Θεὸς γεννᾷ”, “ὁ Θεὸς προβάλλει”, “ὁ Θεὸς δημιουργεῖ” etc., as well as the entire chapter 94 (Πόσα ζητοῦνται πρὸς τὴν σύνθεσιν [*How many are required for the composition to be*]).³³ The latter is an excursus against “the heresy of those whose leaders were Barlaam the Calabrian and the very dangerous (πολυκίνδυνος) Akindynos”,³⁴ in which Scholarios tacitly adopts Duns Scotus' *distinctio formalis a parte rei* in order to confirm against the heretics that the divine operations are different from the divine essence not logically (λόγῳ καὶ κατ' ἐπίνοιαν) but really (πραγματικῶς) according to what they are. They are not πράγματα, which would mean that they are numerically different, but πραγματικά, inherences in the thing (τὶ τοῦ πράγματος καὶ ἐν τῷ πράγματι) which are formally, that is, essentially different because of the very nature of the thing.³⁵

Scholarios also removed the scholastic form of Armandus' commentary and rewrote it so as to improve its readability for the Greek reader. Let me give an example by quoting his adaptation of Armandus' commentary on the transpositions of the word “essence”:

Deinde cum dicit, Et quia ut dictum est. Hoc manifestat quomodo nomen essentiae transferatur in nomen quiditatis et assignat differentias. Et primo dividitur in decem predicamenta et est quod commune ad decem predicamenta; opportet etiam quae ab ipso sumuntur habere significationem aliquam communem omnibus naturis per quas diversa entia in diversis generibus et speciebus collocantur: sicut humanitas est communis **omni-**

Καὶ ἐπειδή, ὡς εἴρηται, τὸ ὄν. Νῦν φανεροὶ πῶς τοῦνομα τῆς οὐσίας μετεφέρεται πρὸς τε τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι <καὶ τὸ εἶδος καὶ τὴν φύσιν,> καὶ δίδωσι τὰς διαφοράς. Καὶ πρῶτον <τίθησιν ἀναγκαῖον τι καὶ χρειῶδες τοῖς προκειμένοις, λέγων ὡς ἐπειδήπερ τὸ ὄν, ὅθεν ἡ οὐσία λαμβάνεται,> εἰς τὰ δέκα διαιρεῖται γένη καὶ κοινόν τί ἔστι ταῖς δέκα κατηγορίαις, δεῖ καὶ τὴν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ λαμβανομένην οὐσίαν κοινόν τι σημαίνειν πάσαις ταῖς φύσεσι, δι' ᾧν τά γε διά-

³² Cf. Schol., *CDEE*, p. 278.9–280.40.

³³ Cf. Schol., *CDEE*, p. 281.1–285.22.

³⁴ Schol., *CDEE*, p. 281.28–31: Γεγόνασι γάρ τινες ἐν ἡμῖν τὴν τῆς θείας οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργείας διάκρισιν λόγῳ, τουτέστιν ἐπινοίᾳ, μόνον τιθέμενοι, ὃν τῆς αἱρέσεως ἡγεμόνες Βαρλαάμ τε ὁ ἐκ Καλαβρῶν καὶ ὁ πολυκίνδυνος ὑπῆρξαν Ἀκίνδυνος.

³⁵ Cf. Schol., *CDEE*, p. 285.15–18: Ὄστε πραγματικῶς μὲν ἔλεγε [sc. ὁ ἱερὸς Γρηγόριος] πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν τοῦ λόγῳ καὶ κατ' ἐπίνοιαν, τοῖς λόγοις δὲ αὐτὰ διέκρινε τοῖς τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι δηλοῦσιν καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ πράγματος φύσεως.

bus hominibus: et partes in quas dividitur homo. Deinde hoc quod dictum est applicat ad propositum et primo ad quiditatem et dicit quod quia id per quod aliquid constituitur primo in genere vel in specie est hoc quod significatur per diffinitionem indicantem quid est res: inde est quod nomen essentie per quod aliquid reponitur in genere vel in specie ideo **a philosophis** mutatur in nomen quiditatis et hoc declarat dicens quod Philosophus frequenter nominat 'quod quid erat esse' per hoc quod aliquid habet esse quid. 2º applicat ad formam dicens quod essentia dicitur forma secundum quod per formam significatur certitudo uniuscuiusque rei ut dicit Avicenna 2º sue Metaphysice. Tercio, nomen essentie applicatur ad naturam. Unde dicit quod essentia etiam dicitur natura accipiendo naturam secundum primum modum illorum quattor, quos Boecius ponit in libro de duabus naturis et una persona christi, scilicet secundum quod natura dicitur esse id quod intellectus quocunque modo caput et assignat rationem dicens quod nulla res est intelligibilis nisi per diffinitionem et essentiam suam, ex eo quod obiectum intellectus est quiditas et essentia rei.¹

φορα ὄντα ἐν διαφόροις εἴδεσι καὶ γένεσι τάττονται, ὥσπερ ἡ ἀνθρωπότης κοινή ἔστι πᾶσι τοῖς μερικοῖς εἰς ἣ διαιρεῖται ὁ ἀνθρωπος. Προσάγων δὲ τῷ προκειμένῳ τὸ εἰρημένον καὶ πρῶτον <έφαρμόζων αὐτό> τῷ τί ἦν εἶναι, φησίν ώς, ἐπειδὴ τὸ δι’ οὗ τί καθίσταται πρώτως ἐν τῷ γένει ἢ τῷ εἴδει ἔστι τὸ διὰ τοῦ ὄρισμοῦ σημαινόμενον, τοῦ δηλοῦντος τί ἔστι τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἐντεῦθεν τούνομα τῆς οὐσίας, δι’οὗ τι ἐν γένει ἢ εἴδει τίθεται, εἰς τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι παρὰ **τῷ Φιλοσόφῳ** μεταλαμβάνεται, <ὅ παρὰ Λατίνοις ἐνὶ δηλοῦται ὄνόματι ἀπὸ τοῦ «τί» παρηγμένω· λέγουσι γάρ αὐτοὶ τὸ μὲν «τί» «κίδ», τὸ δὲ «τί ἦν εἶναι» παραγώγως «κιδίτητα»> καὶ τοῦτ’ ἔστι <κιδίτης> φησίν, ὃ συνεχῶς ὁ Φιλόσοφος ὄνομάζει τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι, τουτέστι τὸ δι’ οὗ τι ἔχει τὸ εἶναι τι. Δεύτερον, ἐφαρμόττει αὐτὸ τῷ εἴδει, φάσκων ώς ἡ οὐσία λέγεται καὶ εἶδος καθὸ τῷ εἴδει σημαίνεται ἡ ἐκάστου πράγματος <ἀλήθεια> καὶ ακρίβεια, ώς Ἀβιγένας ἐν δευτέρῳ τῆς Μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ πραγματείας αὐτοῦ φησί. Τρίτον, ἐφαρμόζει τῇ φύσει, λέγων ώς ἡ οὐσία καὶ φύσις λέγεται, εἰ λαμβάνοιμεν τὴν φύσιν κατὰ τὸν πρότερον τρόπον τῶν τεσσάρων ἐκείνων, οὓς ὁ Βοήτιος ἀφορίζεται ἐν τῇ Περὶ τῶν δύο φύσεων καὶ ἐνὸς προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πραγματείᾳ αὐτοῦ, καθὸ δηλονότι φύσις λέγεται εἶναι τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦ δυνάμενον ὄπωσδηποτοῦν λαμβάνεσθαι· καὶ τὸν τούτου λόγον αὐτίκα ἐπάγει. Φησὶ γάρ ώς οὐδέν ἔστι νοητὸν εἰ μὴ τῷ ὄρισμῷ καὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸ ἀντικείμενον τοῦ νοῦ εἶναι τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν.²

1 I quote Armandus' text after the edition of 1482.

2 Schol., *CDEE*, p. 196.21–197.9.

Nonetheless, Barbour has also pointed out these peculiarities of Scholarios' text.³⁶ Even if we are willing to admit that his verdict on Scholarios was quite harsh, would it not still be true that the Byzantine scholar presented as his own a commentary the greater part of which was not made by him?

It should not escape our notice that Scholarios announces quite clearly his two essential additions to the commentary.³⁷ This should raise our suspicion against Barbour's interpretation. Why should he want to stress his additions in a text that he wished to present as his own, as Barbour thinks? In fact, the title given to Scholarios' work (as it appears in C) does not confirm Barbour's claim that Scholarios asserted that *he* had written the commentary. A more sensitive reader of Greek, I believe, might tell the difference between “ἀπὸ τοῦ λατινικοῦ ἐρμηνευθὲν παρὰ τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου, εἴτα καὶ ἔξηγηθέν” (“translated from the Latin by the most wise and erudite George Scholarios, and then commented on”) and “ἀπὸ τοῦ λατινικοῦ ἐρμηνευθὲν εἴτα καὶ ἔξηγηθέν παρὰ τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου” (“translated from the Latin and then commented on by the most wise and erudite George Scholarios”). The title of the commentary itself (as it appears in Scholarios' autograph *Laurentianus plut.* 86.27, ff. 1r–91v, and in the copy mostly made by Matthaios Camariotes, namely the *Par. Suppl. gr.* 618, ff. 19v–96v) makes no mention of an author: ἔξήγησις εἰς τὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου θωμᾶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀκίνου βιβλίον τὸ περὶ τοῦ εἶναι καὶ τῆς οὐσίας. This title, too, is clearly a translation from the Latin: *commentum super doctoris* (perhaps a “divi” or an “angelici” was left out) *Thome de Aquino librum de esse et essentia*. At any rate, it is reminiscent of the title that appears in the *editio prima* of the work, prepared by Andrea di Urbino in 1482: *Preclarissimi ac eruditissimi sacre theologie magistri Armandi ordinis predicatorum super librum de ente et de essentia Angelici doctoris Thome Aquinatis commentum*,³⁸ with the exception that, in all probability, the copy that Scholarios used for his translation did not include an attribution to an author (as is frequently the case in the manuscript tradition of Armandus' commentary).³⁹

Scholarios translated Thomas' *De ente et essentia* and the commentary on the demand of the most distinguished and beloved of his pupils, namely Matthaios Ca-

³⁶ See Barbour 1993d, 83–90.

³⁷ Cf. Schol., *CDEE*, p. 218.26–30: Καὶ τοῦτο σαφές ἐστιν οὕτως ἔχειν, πρῶτον μὲν ἀξιώματι τοῦ Βοητίου, εἴτα τοῦ Ἀβιγένου, εἴτα τοῦ Ἀβερόν· οὐδὲν ἡμᾶς δεῖ προστιθέναι, ἀλλὰ δύο ταυτὶ μόνον σημειώσασθαι δεῖ...; this passage, which strongly abridges Armandus' commentary, introduces chapter 34. Ἐξήγησις εἰς τὸ περὶ τοῦ εἶναι καὶ τῆς οὐσίας, 278.19–21: Ταῦτα τῇ τοῦ διδασκάλου δόξῃ συμφέροντα εἴρηται, ὡς οἱόμεθα: ἵνα δὲ διεζοδικώτερον ἡμῖν ὁ περὶ τούτων γένηται λόγος, πρῶτον μὲν εἰδέναι δεῖ, ὅτι..., followed by the major part of chapter 93 and chapter 94.

³⁸ Padua: Matthaeus Cerdonis, 1482; this edition does not include Armandus' prefatory letter. A second edition was produced in Venice in 1496.

³⁹ Barbour 1993d, 80, also considers this possibility but he does not bring about the possible consequences.

mariotes.⁴⁰ In the foregoing letter that he addressed to his pupil, Scholarios expresses his scholarly commitment to Thomas but he also acknowledges fully, contrary to Barbour's claim, the merits of the early Thomists:

I do not know whether there is anyone among those who devote themselves to [the study of] Thomas Aquinas that has honoured him more than I have. Nor do I think that if someone devotes himself to the study of Thomas, he will be in need of another Muse, since everyone would love to be able to thoroughly devote himself to a study of his writings. But since some people in Italy, especially those of the habit of Francis, with many of whom I have conversed,⁴¹ associate themselves with later doctors to such an extent that they are led to blame Thomas out of their favour towards later doctors,⁴² although Thomas was much more worthy for those whom they honour,⁴³ even if it has been granted to them to add something to the doctor's writings⁴⁴ or to discover something new, as was entirely reasonable for intelligent students who come afterwards, for these reasons,⁴⁵ as I wish to show you how many subtleties are contained in what they [i. e. contemporary Franciscan scholars] call "this man's thickness", and that they claim these things because they do not understand him rightly and are not able to judge soundly, we should cherish and admire the later doctors for having added something [to Thomas' writings]⁴⁶ but we should justly be more grateful to him as to the teacher of all and, at the same time, the most precise. This is why he has received the approbation of the Roman Church, while the others are honoured only in the schools. This is what I wanted to show you and I undertook the present work: I have translated for you and transferred to our language, the language of the Greeks, so far as I could, the book of the doctor (αὐτό τε τοινύν τὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου βιβλίον ἡμιήνευκα...), in which he treats of essence and being, or, as others intitle it, of quiddity and essence, and I add a certain exegesis of the doctor's discourse (καὶ ἔξηγησίν τινα τῶν τοῦ διδασκάλου λόγων προστίθημι), which is compatible with Aristotle's rules, where they apply, and with the doctrine of Thomas himself, which we know that he had formed about the totality of reality; no one of the school of later doctors is mixed in this exegesis, because this is not at all needful.⁴⁷ You know, of

40 Cf. Scholarios' post-scriptum in *Par. Suppl. gr.* 618, f. 19v (Schol., CDEE, p. 178.5–9): "This is why, showing favour to the most distinguished of our pupils and friends, we translated into Greek and subsequently explained this treatise. For having learned from us how exquisite it is, we wanted us to undertake this labour so as to benefit him and everyone else who would be able [to benefit from it]" (Διὸ καὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ὅμιλτῶν καὶ φίλων τῷ σπουδαιοτάτῳ χαριζόμενοι, ἡμιηνέυκαμέν τε ἐλληνικῶς, εἴτα καὶ ἔξηγησάμεθα τὴν πραγματείαν· μαθών γάρ ἐξ ἡμῶν τὸ ταύτης ἔξηρημένον, ἐδέηθη ἡμῶν τὸν τοιοῦτον ὑποστῆναι πόνον διὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀλλων τῶν δυναμένων ὥφελειαν. Here, it is true, Scholarios appears to credit to himself the composition of the entire commentary. I take it that this is meant here in a loose sense, which becomes narrower in the προοίμιον of the commentary).

41 Barbour 1993d, 46: "whose school, so to speak, I have often frequented". I hereby note only the most significant of Barbour's errors.

42 Barbour: "associate themselves more with later teachers, whom they allege in their opinion to surpass him".

43 Barbour: "and yet Thomas is by far more worthy than those they honor".

44 Barbour: "the teacher's insights".

45 Barbour: "through these present writings".

46 Barbour: "For on the one hand it is necessary to cherish and admire later teachers as having truly added something to knowledge".

47 Barbour: "And so I have set forth an interpretation of the teacher's reasonings compatible with the rules of Aristotle from whence they arose, and with the thought of Thomas himself, without anyone of

course, that at other occasions we take much pleasure in the inquiring and dithyrambic investigations of the later doctors, too, and we are, so to speak, infatuated about them. At this occasion, however, it was necessary not to imbue the present book with a foreign doctrine, since both the meaning of the thoughts expressed in the book and its method suffice for duly honouring both the father of the book and those who have proposed to explicate it (*τῷ τοῦ βιβλίου πατρὶ καὶ τοῖς τοῦτ' ἔξηγεισθαι προηρμένοις*): the method falls short in nothing with regard to the best, while the meaning of the thoughts expressed, which he who has goodwill is able to gather from Thomas' other books and from the books of his fellow [Dominicans] and his followers, is most profound and true,⁴⁸ except for a few cases, in which he differs from our Church, not because of himself but because he is affected in common with those who were affected first. And we ought to interpret Thomas by Thomas. For we should not make this error with regard to anybody, and especially not for Thomas, the best and most virtuous among Latin doctors^{49,50}

the school which came after him being mixed in with it, as this is not at all needful". The next period is omitted by Barbour.

48 Barbour: "With the present work there is no need to take anything from another understanding, that of the book's author and of the preferred sources of interpretation being sufficient for a fitting study of the meaning and method of inquiry of the book, which nowhere falls short of the best in depth and in truth..."

49 Barbour: "For us it is permitted to no other to err except Thomas, the best and most excellent of teachers among the Latins".

50 Schol., CDEE, p. 179.25–180.21: Θωμᾶν γάρ τὸν ἔξ Ακίνου οὐκ οἶδα εἴ τις ἐμοῦ πλέον τετίμηκε τῶν αὐτῷ προσεχόντων οὔτ' εἴ τις αὐτῷ προσέχοι, τούτῳ δεήσειν οἵμαι Μούσης ἔτερας, ἀγαπητὸν μέντ' ἂν εἶναι παντὶ προσέχειν αὐτῷ καλῶς δύνασθαι. Άλλ' ἐπειδὴ τῶν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ ὄντων τινές, μάλιστα οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ σχῆματος τοῦ Φραγγίσκου, ὃν οὐν δόλιοις ὡμίληκα, ύστεροις τισὶ διδασκάλοις οὕτω πάνυ προστίθενται ὥστ' αὐτῷ προάγεσθαι τῇ εἰς ἐκείνους εὐνοίᾳ κατηγορεῖν, καίτοι τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτῶν τιμωμένοις πολλοῦ Θωμᾶς ἀξιος ἐγεγόνει, εἰ καὶ τι αὐτοῖς ἐκγέγονεν ἐπινοῆσαι τι τοῖς τοῦ διδασκάλου καὶ ἐφευρεῖν, ὡς εὐφυέσι τε μαθηταῖς καὶ ύστεροις ὅλως εἰκός ἦν, διὰ δὴ ταῦτα δεῖξαι σοι βουλόμενος ὅσας λεπτότητας ἡν φασιν αὐτοὶ παχύτητα τοῦ ἀνδρός περιέχει, καὶ ὡς διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐπαΐειν αὐτοῦ καλῶς οὕθ' ὑγιάς διαιτᾶν ἔχειν ταῦτ' ἀξιονῖ, δέον τοὺς μὲν ύστερους φιλεῖν τε καὶ θαυμάζειν ὡς δὴ τι καὶ ἐπινεοηκότας, ἐκείνων δὲ ὡς ἀπάντων καθηγεμόνι μείζω χάριν ἔχειν δικαιώς καὶ ἄμα ἀκριβεστέρωφ' διὸ καὶ τῶν παρὰ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἐκκλησίας ψήφων τετύχηκε, τῶν ἄλλων μόνον ἐν τοῖς διατριβαῖς τιμωμένων· καὶ τοῦτο σοι τοίνυν δεῖξαι βουλόμενος, ὑπέστην τὸ ἔργον. Αὐτό τε τοίνυν τὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου βιβλίον ἡμίμηνευκά σοι καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν φωνὴν μετήνεγκα, τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ὡς οἴδις τε ἐγενόμην, ἐν ᾧ δὴ περὶ τῆς οὐσίας τε καὶ τοῦ εἶναι πραγματεύεται, εἴτε περὶ τοῦ τι ἦν εἶναι καὶ τῆς οὐσίας, ὡς ἔτεροι ἐπιγράφουσι, καὶ ἔξηγησιν τινα τῶν τοῦ διδασκάλου λόγων προστίθημι, τοῖς τε Ἀριστοτελικοῖς κανόσιν, ἔνθα ἔξεστιν, οἰκείαν καὶ τῇ αὐτοῦ Θωμᾶ γνώμῃ, ἦν ἵσμεν αὐτὸν περὶ τῶν ὅλων σχόντα συντεθειμένην, τῆς τῶν ύστερων αἱρέσεως οὐδὲνδὲ αὐτῇ ἐπιμειγμένου, δότι μὴ πᾶσα ἀνάγκη. Κάκεινων γάρ ταῖς περιέργοις καὶ διθυράμβοις ζητήσεσιν ἄλλοτε, ὡς οἴσθα, ἐνασμενίζομεν καὶ οἶον εἰπεῖν ἐγκορυφαντιώμεν, ἀλλὰ νῦν τῷ παρόντι βιβλίῳ οὐδὲν ἄλλοτρίας γνώμης ἐπικεχρῶσθαι ἔχρην, ἀρκούσης αὐτῷ τε τῷ τοῦ βιβλίου πατρὶ καὶ τοῖς τοῦτ' ἔξηγεισθαι προηρμένοις πρὸς τὴν ἑκατέροις πρέπουσαν φιλοτιμίαν τῆς τοῦ βιβλίου διανοίας τε καὶ μεθόδου, τῆς μὲν οὐδαμῆ τῶν ἀρίστων λειπομένης, τῆς δὲ βαθείας τε πάνυ καὶ ἀληθοῦς οὖσης, ἦν ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων αὐτοῦ βιβλίων καὶ τῶν ἑταίρων αὐτοῦ καὶ ὀπαδῶν ἔξεστιν ἀθροίζειν τῷ βουλομένῳ καλῶς, πλὴν ἐν δόλιοις, ἐν οἷς πρὸς τὴν ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίαν διαφέρεται, οὐκ αὐτόθεν τοῦτο παθών, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πρώτοις πεπονθόσι συμπάσχων. Οὐδὲ ἔχρην τὰ τοῦ Θωμᾶ μὴ κατὰ Θωμᾶν ἔξηγεισθαι· τοῦτο γάρ οὐδὲ ἄλλω τινὶ προσῆκεν ἔξαμαρτάνεσθαι παρ' ἡμῶν, μὴ ὅτι γε Θωμᾶ, τῶν ἐν Λατίνοις διδασκάλων ἀρίστω τε καὶ σπουδαιοτάτω.

On a close reading of Scholarios' prefatory letter to Camariotes, it becomes clear that Scholarios endeavoured to provide a translation together with an interpretation of the *De ente et essentia* in order to defend Thomas, "the best and most virtuous among Latin doctors", against accusations made by contemporary Franciscan friars; these Franciscans, contrary to their fathers, claimed that Thomas' writings lacked in philosophical subtlety. Scholarios wished to defend Thomas not in theology but in philosophy. To do so, he brought to Camariotes' attention, and consequently decided to translate, the *De ente et essentia*, Thomas' most subtle philosophical work. But this was not all. For his defence to be strong, he needed to add a commentary that would be properly Thomistic, that is, free from later clarifications (οὐδὲ ἔχρην τὰ τοῦ Θωμᾶ μὴ κατὰ Θωμᾶν ἔξηγεισθαι). It would certainly destroy Scholarios' argument to try to defend Thomas' philosophical acumen by bringing in subtle distinctions made by Franciscan scholars, say by Duns Scotus (c. 1266–1308) or Francis of Mayrone (c. 1280–1328), as it would also destroy his argument to try to defend him from the point of view of a fifteenth century Orthodox Greek. Quite the opposite of what Barbour believed,⁵¹ Scholarios had no reason to lead Camariotes astray by presenting as his own a commentary that he needed to be, for his defence of Thomas against contemporary Franciscans, properly Thomistic. "Now, devote yourself to the exegesis that begins", says Scholarios to Camariotes at the end of his letter, "examining with precision whether it is devoted to the most wise Thomas".⁵²

As Armandus' commentary on the *De ente et essentia* is in many manuscripts transmitted anonymously,⁵³ it is highly probable that Scholarios did not know who

⁵¹ Cf. also Barbour 1993d, 81: "Scholarios would have returned to Constantinople with the precious commentary in his possession. Under pressure to show some fruit from his Italian sojourn, but lacking the time to work independently, he translated Armandus' commentary and presented it as though it were the result of his own researches. Nothing could better corroborate his claim to be the only man in Byzantium who really knew Latin thought than the fact that he does not have the slightest fear that someone will recognize his work as that of *De Bellovisu*". This is, of course, pure speculation.

⁵² Schol., *CDEE*, p. 180.25–26: Καὶ δὴ ἀρχομένη τῇ ἔξηγήσει προσέχοις ἄν, σκοπῶν ἀκριβῶς εἴ τι αὕτη προσέχοι τῷ σοφωτάτῳ Θωμᾷ.

⁵³ Barbour 1993d, 79–80 n. 194, mentions the *Pisanus*, Seminario Arcivescovile di Santa Caterina 115, ff. 1r–27v, copied in 1425 at Pavia, the *Vaticanus lat. 2155*, ff. 77r–91v, copied in 1428, and the *Marcianus VI.163* (2673), ff. 45–78, copied in 1443 at Padua, as manuscripts that transmit anonymously Armandus' commentary, and the *Marcianus VI.160* (2816), ff. 1r–21r, copied at Padua between 1448 and 1467, as a manuscript that attributes also the commentary to Thomas Aquinas. Senko 1958 mentions the following manuscripts that contain the commentary anonymously: Krakow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, ms. 2229, anno 1442, ff. 150–173 (*inc. Scriptum super sanctum Thomam de ente et essentia; des. Explicit sentencia brevis super sanctum Thomam de esse et essentia magistri Wilhelmi ordinis predicatorum scriptum Londini 1442 in vigilia palmarum*); Wroclaw, Biblioteka Kapitulina, ms. 70 n, anno 1419, ff. 245vb–276ra (*inc. Dilectis in christo fratribus et sociis... Libellus ergo iste cuius subiectum vel materia est essentia; des. Explicit scriptum super beatum thomam de ente et essentia quod edidit quidam frater ordinis predicatorum, eius nomen scriptum est in libro vite*); Wroclaw, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, ms. IV Q 15, anno 1440, ff. 206–228; Wroclaw, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, ms. IV Q 17, anno

its author was. His reference to “those who have proposed to explain the book” (τοῖς τοῦτ’ ἔξηγεῖσθαι προηρημένοις) suggests that he considered that he had before him a cumulative exegesis, a collection of ζητήματα with the solutions proposed by several Dominican scholars in the course of time. Such a reading is also presupposed in the Greek title of the *pinax* that precedes the commentary: Πίναξ τῶν ἐμπειρεχομένων τῇ ἔξηγήσει ζητημάτων, ἀ καὶ λύεται κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Θωμᾶ δόξαν μᾶλλον ἢ τὴν τοῦ λύοντος τὰ πλειά [Table of the questions contained in the exegesis, which are solved according to the doctrine of Thomas rather than according to the doctrine of him who solves most of them]. The doctrine that solves most of the problems must be Scotus’ doctrine, at least if it is in this sense that “ζητήματα” are meant in the following passage of Scholarios’ letter:

When we give the privilege to the elder [i. e. Thomas], we are not ashamed of Francis [of Mayrone] or his teacher [i. e. Duns Scotus], although we admire above measure the subtlety of their minds as well and we side with them on many problems.⁵⁴

I think that Barbour was misled in his interpretation not only by his problematic understanding of Scholarios’ subtle Greek but also by his absolute readiness to see in Scholarios a Thomist – a “Byzantine” or a “Palamite” Thomist but still a Thomist –⁵⁵ that is, as someone who would adopt the Thomistic principle “Divus Thomas ipse sui optimus interpres” for its own sake, i. e. as a safe way leading to the truth. The issue, however, is in my view more complicated. Scholarios was interested in philosophy, very interested in Latin philosophy and extremely interested in the philosophical distinctions introduced in theology by the Latin doctors. If there has to be a single work to capture his stance towards his Latin fellows, it has to be “eclecticism”.⁵⁶ Scholarios was unwilling to subscribe to the Barlaamite reading of Thomas and willing to ascribe to Thomas knowledge of the *distinctio formalis a parte rei*, so as to make him conso-

1427, ff. 9–47v (*inc.* *Dilectis in christo fratribus et sociis*. Libellus ergo iste cuius subiectum vel materia est essentia; *des.* Explicit scriptum super librum *De ente et essencia sancti thome de aquino ordinis fratrum predicatorum deo gracias amen*). Glorieux 1934 the manuscripts Venezia, *Biblioteca di San Marco*, cl. X cod. 185, ff. 45–78, and Lisboa, Bibl. Nac. Fondo Geral, cod. 2241, ff. 1–46v (*inc.* *Reverendis in Christo fratribus et consociis salutem in eo qui est scientiarum omnium fundamentum*. Libellus ergo iste cuius substantia vel materia est essentia). Stegmueller 1935, 89, the manuscript Roma, *Biblioteca Angelica*, cod. 104, ff. 22v–32r (*inc.* *Dilectis in Christo fratribus et consociis*. – Libellus ergo iste cuius subiectum vel materia).

⁵⁴ Schol., *CDEE*, p. 180.21–24: Οὗτε δὲ Φραγγίσκον οὕτε τὸν αὐτῶν καθηγεμόνα αἰδούμεθα, εἰ τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ νέμομεν, καὶ τοι καὶ αὐτῶν τὴν τῶν φρενῶν λεπτότητα ὑπεραγάμενοι, καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς τῶν ζητημάτων αὐτοῖς τιθέμενοι μᾶλλον.

⁵⁵ Livanos 2006c and Kappes 2013c also challenge Barbour’s view.

⁵⁶ See also Kappes 2013c, 86, who rightly calls Scholarios an “eclectic philosopher and theologian”. Kappes argues that Scholarios’ Scotism, probably developed through his acquaintance with the writings of Hervaeus Natalis, makes him irreconcilable to orthodox Thomism.

nant with the Palamite doctrine, but he makes clear that he was not so interested in Thomas as to defend him at any price⁵⁷:

They [i. e. the Barlaamites] thought that they had this doctor as well, I mean Thomas Aquinas, as an advocate of their doctrine, since Thomas refused that these [i. e. the divine essence and energy] were really distinct and claimed that they differ [only] in [human] reason. Indeed, Barlaam seemed to “breathe” the doctrines of this doctor (although he completely despised him in the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit); this was the reason for which the followers of Barlaam and Akindynos translated the books of this doctor into the language of the Greeks, wishing to procure for themselves a strong alliance thanks to his wisdom and to convince everyone else [of the rightness of their doctrine] and, in addition to that, to hold up the Roman Church, which, it too, through Thomas seemed to hold the same doctrine, being ignorant of the fact that many among the Latin doctors determined the things involved in this problem in more accordance with the holy Gregory, Metropolitan of Thessalonica, and our entire Church than with them; it would be unjust to despise these doctors, who are most wise and have received the approbation of our Church insofar as they evidently seemed to think the things we do.⁵⁸

That Thomas did not ignore the difference of definitions, i. e. the formal [difference] or [the difference] from the very nature of the thing, and that he named these distinctions, which are other than the real [distinction]⁵⁹ and smaller than that, “differences of reason” in a large sense, everyone could easily gather from his writings. But this is now not what we propose to examine, in this incidental investigation, but rather our Holy Church and the [doctrines of the] blessed Gregory, Metropolitan of Thessalonica, for the sake of whom we have digressed to the present discourse. In view of this, it should be left to others to examine Thomas’ view with regard to this issue, how it relates to other doctors and to the truth. For we are not so exceedingly interested in Thomas as to plead for him with all our means, although otherwise this man seemed to us admirable in the previous time and he still seems so.⁶⁰

57 An indirect statement against the Cydones brothers may be detected here.

58 Schol., *CDEE*, p. 283.4–19: “Ωντο δέ καὶ τὸν διδάσκαλον τοῦτον, τὸν ἐξ Ακίνου λέγω Θωμᾶν, συνήγορον ταύτης ἔχειν τῆς δόξης, πραγματικῶς μὲν διακερίσθαι ταῦτα οὐκ ἀνεχόμενον, λόγῳ δὲ διαφέρειν ἀξιοῦντα. Ὁ γάρ Βαρλαάμ ἐκεῖνος τὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου τούτου πνεῖν ἐδόκει (εἰ κἀντα περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ Πνεύματος ζητήματι πάνυ τούτου καταπεφρόνηκεν), δὸ δέ καὶ γέγονε τοῖς περὶ τὸν Βαρλαάμ καὶ τὸν Ακίνδυνον αἴτιον τοῦ τὰ βιβλία τοῦ διδασκάλου τούτου μεταβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλήνων φωνήν, ὡς ἀν καὶ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διδασκάλου τούτου σοφίας ικανήν ἐπαγόμενοι τὴν συμμαχίαν, τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας συμπείθωσι, πρὸς τούτους δὲ καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπανατείνωσιν, ταύτα καὶ αὐτὴν διὰ τοῦ Θωμᾶ δοκοῦσαν πρεσβεύειν, οὐκ εἰδότες ὅτι πολλοὶ τῶν παρὰ Λατίνοις διδασκάλων συμφωνότερον τῷ ιερῷ Γρηγορίῳ τῷ Θεοσαλονίκης καὶ τῇ καθ' ήμας ἐκκλησίᾳ συμπάσῃ ἡ αὐτοῖς τὰ περὶ τούτου τοῦ προβλήματος διωρίσαντο, ὃν οὐκ ἀν ἦν δικαιον καταφρονεῖν, σοφωτάτων τε ὄντων καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ήμετέρας ἐκκλησίας ψήφον ἔχόντων, ἡ ταύτα φρονεῖν ἔδοξαν ἐναργώς.

59 That is, the distinction of *práγματα*, as opposed to those which are distinct *πραγματικῶς*.

60 Schol., *CDEE*, p. 284.2–14: Καὶ ὅτι τὴν τῶν λόγων διαφοράν, εἴτοις τὴν εἰδικήν ἡ τὴν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πράγματος φύσεως οὐκ ἡγνόει Θωμᾶς, καὶ ὅτι ταύτας τὰς παρὰ τὴν πραγματικὴν διακρίσεις καὶ ἐλάττους αὐτῆς ἐξηπλωμένως διαφορὰς λόγου ὡνόμαζεν, ἐκ τῶν ἐκείνου συγγραμμάτων πᾶς τις ἀν ῥαδίως κατίδοι. Άλλ' ἴμιν οὐ νῦν περὶ αὐτοῦ πρόκειται μᾶλλον σκοπεῖν ἐν τῷ παρέργῳ τῆς τοιαύτης ζητήσεως ἡ περὶ τῆς ιερᾶς ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῦ μακαρίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεοσαλονίκης, ὃν χάριν προύργου πρὸς τὸν περὶ τούτων ἔξηνέγχθημεν λόγον. “Οθεν τὰ μὲν κατὰ τὸν Θωμᾶν, ὅσον ἐν τῷδε

Scholarios did not belong to Thomas' ὄπαδοι that he mentions in his letter; he was not a follower but an admirer of Thomas. Although he speaks indeed more enthusiastically of the philosophical acumen of the Scotist School,⁶¹ and he finds Scotists more compatible with the Eastern Church,⁶² he seems to have initially admired Thomas for his extended wisdom, i. e. for his mastery both in philosophy and theology, and to have later considered his writings useful for Christians under Ottoman rule. Except for those cases in which he diverged from the Eastern Church, Thomas is deemed worthy of careful study.⁶³ One might still want to call Scholarios a Thomist, which is fine if one means by this that he was not a Nominalist, or that he did not limit Orthodoxy to simple faith or personal experience. But I cannot really see in what this would help us to better understand his thought. The Latin West and the Byzantine East met exactly at that point which our traditional interpretive and historiographical categories fail to grasp. Scholarios is a case in point.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aristot., <i>Metaph.</i>	<i>Aristotelis Metaphysica</i> , ed. W. Jaeger, Oxford 1957.
Avicenna, <i>Log.</i>	<i>Logica</i> , in Avicenna, <i>Opera philosophica</i> , Venice 1508 (reprint Louvain 1961).
Eustrat., <i>In Anal. Post.</i>	<i>Eustratii In Analyticorum Posteriorum librum secundum commentarium</i> , ed. M. Hayduck, <i>Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca</i> vol. XXI/1, Berlin 1907.
Eustrat., <i>In Eth. Nic.</i>	<i>Eustratii et Michaelis et Anonyma In Ethica Nicomachea commentaria</i> , ed. G. Heylbut, <i>Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca</i> vol. XX, Berlin 1892.
Mich., <i>In Metaph.</i>	<i>Alexandri Aphrodisiensis In Aristotelis Metaphysica commentaria</i> , ed. M. Hayduck, <i>Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca</i> vol. I, Berlin 1891.

τῷ ζητήματι, ἀφείσθω τοῖς ἄλλοις σκοπεῖν ὅπως ἡ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους διδασκάλους ἡ πρός γε αὐτὴν ἀλήθειαν τὰ ἐκείνου ἔχει· οὐ γάρ ἡμῖν διαφέρει πάνυ Θωμᾶς ὥστε αὐτὸν πάσαις ὑπερδικεῖν μηχαναῖς, εἰ καὶ ἄλλως θαυμαστὸς ἡμῖν ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐκεῖνος καὶ ἔδοξε τὸν πρόσθεν χρόνον καὶ νῦν ἔτι δοκεῖ.

61 See the enthusiastic vocabulary in Schol., *CDEE*, p. 180.8–10 (κάκείνων γάρ ταῖς περιέργοις καὶ διθυράμβοις ζητήσεσιν [...] ἐνασμενίζομεν καὶ οἷον εἰπεῖν ἐγκορυφαντιῶμεν) and p. 180.22–23 (καὶ αὐτῶν τὴν τῶν φρενῶν λεπτότητα ὑπεραγάμενοι).

62 Cf. the following explicative note on his letter to Camariotes; Schol., *CDEE*, p. 180.34–35: “The later [doctors] are more orthodox than Thomas because they are closer to us and to the truth, i. e. the followers of the master John Scotus (οἱ ὑστεροὶ μᾶλλον τοῦ Θωμᾶ ὄρθοδοξότεροι ὡς ἡμῖν καὶ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἐγγύτεροι, οἱ περὶ τὸν μαΐστωρα Ἰωάννην δε Σκότζια)”.

63 Cf. Schol., *CDEE*, p. 177.13–14: ...τὰ δὲ ἄλλα σοφὸς καὶ τοῖς ἀναγιγνώσκουσιν ὡφέλιμος; p. 177.26: ἐν οἷς δὲ οὐ διαφέρεται, καὶ σπουδαστέος ἔστιν ὁ ἀνήρ; p. 178.3–4: ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ φιλοῦμεν καὶ ἐκθειάζομεν τὸν σοφὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον.

Schol., DEE	<i>Gennade Scholarios. Traduction et commentaire de l'opuscule de saint Thomas d'Aquin "De Ente et Essentia". A. Traduction.</i> In Louis Petit – Xenophon A. Sideridès – Martin Jugie (editors), <i>Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios</i> , vol. 6/2, Paris 1933, 154–177.
Schol., CDEE	<i>Gennade Scholarios. Traduction et commentaire de l'opuscule de saint Thomas d'Aquin "De Ente et Essentia". B. Commentaire du "De ente et essentia".</i> In Louis Petit – Xenophon A. Sideridès – Martin Jugie (editors), <i>Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios</i> , vol. 6/2, Paris 1933, 177–326.
Thomas, DEE	<i>S. Thomae Aquinatis opusculum De Ente et Essentia</i> , ed. C. Boyer, Rome 1970.

Secondary Sources

Barbour, H. C. (1993d). *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios and His Translation of the Commentary of Armandus de Bellovisu on the "De Ente et Essentia" of Thomas Aquinas*. Vatican City.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2008d). *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400–vers 1472): un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'empire Byzantin*. Paris.

Glorieux, P. (1934). "Le Commentaire d'Armand de Belvézer sur le 'De ente et essentia'". In: *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 6, pp. 94–96.

Kappes, C. W. (2013c). "The Latin sources of the Palamite Theology of George-Gennadius Scholarius". In: *Nicolaus. Rivista di Teologia ecumenico-patristica* 1, pp. 71–114.

Laurent, M.-H. (1930). "Armand de Belvézer et son Commentaire sur le 'de Ente et Essentia'". In: *Revue Thomiste* 35, pp. 426–436.

Livanos, C. (2006c). *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios: Alone Against All of Europe*. Piscataway (NJ).

Petit, L., X. A. Sideridès, and M. Jugie, eds. (1933). *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*. Vol. 6/2. Paris.

Roland-Gosselin O.P., M.-D. (1926). *Le "De ente et essentia" de S. Thomas d'Aquin*. Kain.

Senko, W. (1958). "Les manuscrits des commentaires d'Armand de Bellovisu, de Gérard de Monte et de Jean Verso sur le 'De ente et essentia' de saint Thomas d'Aquin". In: *Mediaevalia philosophica Polonorum* 2, pp. 13–18.

Stegmüller, F. (1935). "A propos du Commentaire d'Armand de Belvézer sur le 'De ente et essentia' de S. Thomas d'Aquin". In: *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 7, pp. 86–91.

Brian M. Jensen

Hugo Eterianus and his Two Treatises in the Demetrius of Lampe Affair

The West is the best,
The West is the best,
Get here, and we'll do the rest
(Jim Morrison, *The End*)

Is Hugo Eterianus' response to Demetrius of Lampe an example of the literal meaning of Kipling's verse "East is east and west is west, and never the twain shall meet"? Or can Hugo's treatises in the matter simply be summed up with Jim Morrison's line, "the West is the best"? This paper provides the background to understanding an exchange that took place in Constantinople quite some time before the final Palaeologan age and even decades before the Fourth Crusade.

The "Demetrius of Lampe affair" begins in the spring of 1166 and has to do with the apparent contradiction in the Gospel of John between Jesus' statement in 10:30: ἐγώ καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ἐν ἑσμὲν ("I and the Father we are one") and that in 14:28: ὁ Πατὴρ μείζων μού ἔστιν ("The Father is greater than me").¹ The official Western Roman understanding of these sayings as well as the arguments for its dogmatic view of the Trinity and the procession of the Spirit as against the Eastern Greek interpretation were treated by the Pisa-born theologian Hugo Eterianus in two treatises, *De minoritate et aequalitate filii hominis ad Deum Patrem* written in 1166 and *De sancto et immortali Deo* in 1176–1177.² Both texts were written in Constantinople at the request of the Byzantine emperor Manuel I Comnenos (1143–1180) and, unusually enough, both were transmitted in a Latin as well as a Greek version according to the information given in the text witnesses. In the *explicit* of the former treatise, our only Latin text witness states that it was "published in Greek in Constantinople" (*Constantinopoli editus greco eloquio*).³ Moreover Hugo writes in his dedication letter to Aimericus, patriarch of the

Within the Ars edendi programme at Stockholm University the plans to prepare a critical edition of Hugo Eterianus' treatise *De sancto et immortali Deo* was instigated by Alessandra Bucossi in 2011 to test an editorial method involving both Latin and Greek philology. Moving to Ca' Foscari University in Venice in 2014, Bucossi made the Hugo Eterianus edition part of her "Futuro in Ricerca" project "The Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries as Forerunners of a United and Divided Europe: Dialogues and Disputes between the Byzantine East and the Latin West", together with Pietro Podolak and Anna Zago.

1 See further P. Classen 1955; A. Dondaine 1958; Mango 1963 and Hussey 2010, 152–180.

2 *De sancto et immortali Deo* is edited in *Patrologia Latina* 202 (hence = PL 202), coll. 227–396.

3 Tarracona, Biblioteca Provincial, ms. 92, f. 185v.

Latin Church in Antioch, that he is sending the latter book “published by myself in both languages” (*editum a me utraque lingua librum*).⁴ Aimericus responded that he had received “the books about the procession of the Holy Spirit written in both Greek and Latin which you sent me” (*libros de processione Spiritus sancti ... tam grece quam latine scriptos misistis*).⁵

According to the preface to *De sancto et immortali Deo* Hugo Eterianus and his younger brother Leo Tuscus were staying at the imperial court in Constantinople in the 1160s.⁶ Whilst the latter was engaged as an official translator at the imperial court, Hugo was acting as Manuel Comnenos’ consultant on Roman Church affairs. Probably for a document for the synod assembled in 1166 to discuss Demetrios of Lampe and the above-mentioned passages in the Gospel of John, the Byzantine emperor had asked Hugo to find statements by Latin church fathers concerning the *filioque* question.⁷ In response to the emperor’s request Hugo compiled the statements in a survey to be presented at the synod in March 1166: this is what constitutes the first book of the treatise *De minoritate ac aequalitate filii hominis ad Deum Patrem*.⁸

Dedicating the treatise to Manuel in the prologue, Hugo presents the *minor Patre* issue in John 14:28 primarily as a question concerning the divine and human natures of Christ and the three *personae* of the Trinity. Defending the traditional Western doctrine with the help of various syllogisms, biblical arguments, the Greek church father Gregory of Nazianzus’ *Sermo* 30 and specific Christological definitions, he concludes the first part of the treatise (§§1–28) by quoting the pseudo-Athanasian Creed *Quicumque vult* 31: “Christ is equal to the Father according to his divine nature, but inferior to the Father according to his human nature” (*Christus est equalis Patri secundum divitatem, minor Patre secundum humanitatem*).

In the second part Hugo presents objections and arguments made by Greek theologians. The first issue concerns the question of Christ’s two natures and the impossibility of comparing his divine and human nature. Hugo’s argument is that “Divine Scripture has its own style (*lingua sua*) and often uses such comparisons regarding things of different nature”.⁹ He illustrates this with biblical examples from the letters of Peter (II Pt 2:10–11), John (I Io 3:18–20) and Paul (I Cor 1:23–25) as well as Genesis 4:13. Such comparisons of different natures are not a new invention of the Roman

⁴ PL 202 col. 230.

⁵ PL 202 col. 231.

⁶ Regarding the lives and works of Hugo Eterianus and his brother Leo Tuscus, see A. Dondaine 1952.

⁷ Praefatio: Sed Constantinopoli cum essem, accersitus sum consulendus a magno atque augustissimo imperatore Manuel, utrumne Latini alias sanctorum haberent auctoritates, quae Spiritum sanctum ex Filio esse asseverarent (PL 202 col. 232).

⁸ The *editio princeps* of this treatise by Pietro Podolak and Anna Zago is going to be published in the next issue of *Revue des Études byzantines*. I am grateful to the editors for sending me their forthcoming edition.

⁹ *De minoritate* §33: Habet enim divina scriptura suam linguam et inter res natura differentes tali sepe uitur comparacione.

Church, says Hugo, because “the apostles and the prophets used this kind of comparisons”.¹⁰

The next objection from the Greeks concerns commensurability, in that we cannot use *maior* or *minor* about God because he is not measureable. To this Hugo makes a triple response. Yes, it is correct that God is beyond and superior to all kinds of measurement, but human beings attribute these qualities to God in order to understand him.¹¹ Moreover, *maior* and *minor* are relative attributes, states Hugo, referring to an example in Cicero’s first rhetorical manual *De inventione*, which he calls “an authority not to disapprove” (*auctoritas minime improbanda*). As his third argument Hugo discusses the attributes in relation to the human nature of Christ as well as a number of biblical passages in the Gospel of John and the Epistle to the Hebrews. To emphasize and enlarge his arguments he adds quotations from the Greek patristic tradition, specifically from two sermons of Cyril of Alexandria (*Sermones 7 and 8 to Hermias*) and the above-mentioned quotation from the pseudo-Athanasian Creed *Quicumque vult* 31, which he assumes belongs to the Greek tradition. He concludes the discussion of measurability with a quotation from the same Creed 20–21, which presents the three *personae* of the Trinity and their mutual relation:

Pater a nullo est nec factus nec creatus nec genitus; Filius a Patre non factus nec creatus sed genitus; Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio non factus nec creatus nec genitus sed procedens.

The Father is of none, neither made, nor created, nor begotten. The Son is of the Father, neither made nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made nor created nor begotten, but proceeding.

Further Greek objections are introduced in the form of specific syllogisms concerning the *maior-minor* issue followed by Hugo’s responses in §§68–92. Summarizing and reaffirming the view of the Roman Church with further biblical references and philosophical syllogisms in §§93–105, Hugo concludes the treatise with an exhortation to his Greek opponents to confess “that Christ is without doubt *minor* than the Father according to his human nature”,¹² and in his appeal to Manuel he asks the emperor to show indulgence with the shortcomings of the treatise, since “I am human and like many others a portrait of imbecility and an image of adversion”.¹³

10 *De minoritate* §39: *Neque enim Romana ecclesia ... huiuscemodi inducere comparacionem differentium naturarum facere incepit, sed apostoli et prophete huiusmodi usi sunt comparacionibus.*

11 *De minoritate* §45: *igitur Deus immensus est, nos vero mensura illius egemus propter duas causas: et una quidem ut de ipsa loquamur, altera vero ut salutem consequamur.*

12 *De minoritate* §106: *Profitere nobiscum quoniam sine aliqua dubitacione minor existit Patre secundum humanitatem Christus et quiesce quicumque sis contraria persentiscaens.*

13 *De minoritate* §108: *Nam homo sum et ego ut alii plerique simulacrum imbecillitatis et adversionis imago.*

When analyzing Hugo's presentation of Latin authoritative arguments concerning John 14:28, it may *prima vista* seem rather puzzling that he confines his references to the Bible and certain authors in the Greek patristic tradition but avoids direct references to and quotations of his Greek contemporaneous opponents¹⁴ as well as of the Latin tradition. However, comparing his arguments and syllogisms with such early Latin fathers as Ambrose, Augustine and Gregory the Great, we might observe a number of more or less direct quotations or formulas from these authors, especially Augustine's interpretations in Tractatus 48 and 78 of the two above-mentioned passages in the Gospel of John in his *In evangelium Iohannis tractatus CXXIV*.¹⁵

Let us turn to Hugo's longer and later treatise *De sancto et immortali Deo* from 1176–1177, in which the focus changes from the discussion of John 14:28 to, in Hugo's opinion, the more important question concerning the Trinity. But before we take up Hugo's presentation and discussion of the Trinity and the *Filioque* controversy, let us look at the various titles given to his treatise in the extant manuscripts and in the *Patrologia Latina* edition. Without further ado we can disregard the erroneous title in PL 202, *De haeresibus quas Graeci in Latinos devolvunt*, since no such title appears in the Latin text witnesses, and likewise the contextually constructed title *De processione Spiritus sancti* in fol. 49 in the sixteenth century Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Ms. 207. Instead we should focus on the two almost identical titles transmitted in the other witnesses: *De sancto et immortali Deo*, which is the one repeated in the rubrics to all the three books in most of the oldest manuscripts, and *De immortali Deo*, which we find in a few of the oldest manuscripts. The latter appears to be Hugo's own title according to the opening phrase in his letter to Pope Alexander (*exactum a me opus de immortali Deo*)¹⁶ as well as the one mentioned by his brother Leo Tuscus in the preface to one of his works (*editio libri de immortali Deo*).¹⁷ Therefore, it seems more correct as well as tempting to use the latter title, but for now I will keep the former since this is the one generally used by scholars in references to Hugo's treatise.

After the synod in March 1166 Hugo remained in Constantinople and collected various theological and philosophical arguments in defense of the Roman Church's doctrine and of his criticism of the development of the Greek view on the *filioque* ques-

¹⁴ Only the Arian heretic Apollinarius of Laodicea, condemned at the council in Constantinople in 381, is mentioned and criticized: *De minoritate* §75: Hoc Apollinarii est adinvencio qui opinabatur corpus de celo Christum habuisse atque per virginem ut per cuniculum aqua venisse; and §78: Cum audis quoniam filius hominis in celo erat prius non veniat in mentem de celo corpus descendisse, hoc enim Marcelli et Apollinarii deliramentum. Nam etsi secundum quod homo ascendit, tamen *ubi erat prius filius hominis non secundum naturam sed secundum personam intelligendum*.

¹⁵ Augustinus, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV*, ed. by R. Willems, 2nd ed. Turnhout 1990 (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 36).

¹⁶ PL 202 col. 227.

¹⁷ In his *De haeresibus et praevericationibus Graecorum* Leo Tuscus states that Hugo gave Manuel Comnenos an edition of the three *libri De immortali Deo*, *quem tota Graecia miratur et expavescit*; A. Dondaine 1952, 126.

tion, which he had slightly touched upon in the above quotation from the pseudo-Athanasian Creed 20–21. Because of the “boiling contrariety between the Greeks and the Latins”, he pinpoints the very basis of the controversy towards the end of his preface: “The Greeks appear to defend vehemently the view that the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, whereas the Latins confess that the same Spirit proceeds equally from the Father and the Son”.¹⁸

Considering the Trinity as the fundamental issue at stake, as indicated in the opening words of the opening chapter *beatam et immortalem trinitatem*, Hugo takes as his point of departure philosophical statements from the pre-Christian Greek world, as if he wants to say to his opponents: “Look at your heritage which should be considered common ground for the Greek as well as the Roman Church”. Opening his treatise with a direct quotation in Greek of Plato’s Second Letter to the Sicilian tyrant Dionysios II, and adding a Latin translation of Plotinus’ view on the triad, Hugo emphasizes that the original doctrinal and philosophical harmony regarding the Trinity was an accepted point of view in the Christian tradition:

Beatam et immortalem Trinitatem, quae per Iesum Christum apostolis perspicue ut possibile erat innotuit, gentium philosophi sub enigmatibus valde caliginosis abscondendo publicabant. Nam Plato philosophus Dionysio talia de Trinitate scripsit: Φραστέον δή σοι δί' αἰνιγμόν, ὃν' αὐτῇ ἡ δέλτος ἡ πόντου, ἡ γῆς ἐν πτυχαῖς πάθη, ὁ ἀναγνούς μὴ γνῷ. Ωδε γάρ ἔσχει περὶ τὸν πάντων βασιλέα. Πάντα ἔστι, καὶ ἔκεινον ἔνεκα πάντα, καὶ ἔκεινον αἴτιον ἀπάντων τῶν καλῶν· δεύτερον δὲ περὶ τὰ δεύτερα, καὶ τρίτον περὶ τὰ τρίτα, quod Latine sic sonat redditum orationi: “Dicendum tibi per enigmata, ubi ne liber seu ponti seu terrae in tabulis patiatur, qui legit non intelligat. Hoc enim modo habet circa omnium regem, omnia est, omniaque propter illum, et ipse utique causa omnium bonorum; secundum circa secunda; et tertium circa tertia”. Plotinus quoque similia edidit. Tria sunt, inquit, tempus excedentia et aeterna, bonum, mens et anima universitatis. Hoc est apud nos, Pater, Verbum et Spiritus sanctus, quem philosophi animam mundi nuncupaverunt.¹⁹

The blessed and immortal Trinity, which the apostles came to know through Jesus Christ as manifestly as was possible, the philosophers of antiquity revealed secretly under very obscure riddles. For the philosopher Plato wrote the following to Dionysius about the Trinity: “This should be expounded to you through a riddle in order that if anything happen to this tablet in the folds of sea or land, the reader may not understand. Thus stands the matter: Related to the king of all are all things, and for his sake they are, and he is the cause of all fair things; and related to the second are the second things, and to the third the third things” (Plato *Ep.* 312d). Translated into Latin it sounds in this way: “It should be [...] the third things”. Plotinus also wrote similar things: “There are three things, he said, which are eternal and go beyond time: the good, the mind and the soul of all things.” In our thinking this means: Father, Word and the Holy Spirit, whom the philosophers have called the world soul.

¹⁸ Praefatio: Inter Graecos Latinosque contrarietas exaestuat: Graecus sane quod ex Patre solo Spiritus procedat, vehemens appetit assertor; Latinus autem aequaliter ex Patre et Filio progressum eiusdem Spiritus profitetur (*PL* 202 col. 233).

¹⁹ *De sancto et immortali Deo* 1,1 (*PL* 202 col. 233).

According to Hugo this harmonious view was put to the test when Theodoret of Cyrus (393–458/466) as the first amongst Greek theologians denied the procession of the Spirit from the Son and preached this view (*negationis huius inventor et preco*). Since Theodoret and the theologians sharing his views later had been using syllogisms in their argumentation, which was a conventional part of the philosophical and cultural *milieu* of the twelfth century, Hugo described and defined his own concept of syllogisms in chap. 4. On this basis he uses the first two books of his treatise to refute Byzantine arguments and the syllogisms against the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, using syllogisms and quotations from and references to the Bible and fathers of the Church in both Greek and Latin traditions as well as arguments from Plato, Aristotle and other ancient Greek philosophers, whereas he dedicates the third Book to presenting a positive defense of the Roman Church.

In addition to the change of focus from the *minor Patre* issue in the early treatise to the discussion of the Trinity in *De sancto et immortali Deo* we can observe a change in Hugo's way of describing his Greek opponents and in his literary style and language. As mentioned above, he appears rather diplomatic when addressing his opponents and describing their views in the 1166 treatise, which we may liken to the respectful attitude expressed in Kipling's poem on East and West. This lenient attitude is dramatically different in the later treatise, the aggressive language of which corresponds more to the tone in Morrison's "The West is the best". From the very beginning Hugo mentions the names of his opponents, often in a condescending manner: e. g. Nicetas of Nicomedia is in chap. 3 introduced not by his name but as *Nicomediae praesul* and in chap. 6 as the *Nicomediae metropolita* who is unable to use syllogisms correctly (*non recte syllogizat*) and thereby reaches a false conclusion in his paralogism (*huius paralogismi falsam conclusionem*).²⁰ Similarly, the vocabulary he uses to describe the Greek theologians and their works and arguments appears rather hostile as in the example above as well as in chap. 7 where Niketas of Byzantium, who is described with the epithet *Byzantius philosophus*, tries *per inconvenientium inductionem* to prove that "the Spirit does not proceed from the Son, and that there could be something in the Father and from the Father without the Son".²¹ Such reasoning is pure nonsense (*nugae*), says Hugo.

Between Theodoret and the above-mentioned Greek theologians, who were more or less contemporary with Hugo, we find the real culprit in the development of the Greek view on the Trinity according to Hugo, i. e. the controversial ecumenical patriarch Photius (ca. 810–891).²² In the *De sancto et immortali Deo* Photius is introduced in chap. 15 of Book 2 after a discussion of the controversy between Theodoret and Cyril,

²⁰ PL 202 col. 242.

²¹ *De sancto et immortali Deo* I,7: 'Sed Nicetas Byzantius philosophus per inconvenientium inductionem probare decertat, quod non procedat Spiritus ex Filio, et aliquid esse in Patre et ex Patre sine Filio' (PL 202 col. 244).

²² Bucossi 2012, 312–314.

and the arguments against him occupy the rest of the book (chaps. 15–19). Apart from mentioning the official title *patriarcha Constantinopoleos* Hugo does not use diplomatic niceties in his description of Photius as the following lines may illustrate:

(Photii patriarchae Constantinopoleos) ... Cuius quidem sophismatum laquei, et tristes et atrocies iniuriae in Latinos, breviter hic, quia sermo appetit, exprimendae sunt. Hic enim est qui post Theodoritum in aequorea puteum fodiens arena, non semina, sed Cienena venena sepeliendo, diri valde languoris fidei Christianorum causa factus est. Profecto hunc cum suis complicibus Isaías deplorat dicendo: *Vae qui sapientes sunt apud semetipsos et in oculis suis prudentes* (Is. 5:21). At vero iam exponenda est superciliosa et extraria mendacium amantis patriarchae contradicito et turpiloquium.²³

(Photius, patriarch of Constantinople) ... The snares of his sophisms and his wicked and atrocious injustices against the Latins need to be expressed briefly here, since my treatise requires it. For he is the one after Theodoret who, while digging a well in the sandy sea, by burying not seeds but Cienenous poison, has been the cause of the very dire weariness in the faith of the Christians. He and his connections are certainly the ones Isaiah deplores when saying: *Alas those who are wise to themselves and prudent in their own eyes*. But now it is time to expose the serious and extraneous contradiction of this falsehood-loving patriarch and his immoderate words.

This is but one example of Hugo's aggressive and condescending tone toward Photius and his followers, who wrote “what not even the gentiles had fabricated in their fairy tales” (*quod neque gentilium fabulae confinxerunt*).²⁴ But rather than going into specific details of the controversy I would like to summarize this short presentation of Hugo Eterianus' two treatises with a few additional observations. First of all, I find this author a most interesting *persona*, both in the Latin and the Greek tradition, since he is one of the few Latin theologians in the twelfth century who knows and writes in both Latin and Greek. He also studied the theology of the two churches as well as the history of ancient philosophy, and appears to be quite familiar with the theological and dogmatic development of the entire Christian tradition from the biblical foundations and the early patristic fathers to his contemporary Greek opponents. These qualities enabled him to quote and discuss the relevant authors in both languages.

Moreover, it should be observed that Hugo is not our only witness to the exegetical and doctrinal debate and controversy during the last part of Manuel I Comnenos' reign. Regarding the contents and the environment in which it was written, Hugo's treatise may be compared to other texts from the same period and context as well as from a few decades earlier, not least the first part of Andronikos Kamateros' *Sacrum Armamentarium*,²⁵ which was also commissioned by Manuel Comnenos, written in the early 1170s with arguments against the Roman Church. According to Alessandra Bu-

²³ PL 202, col. 317.

²⁴ PL 202 col. 322.

²⁵ *Editio princeps* of Andronikos Kamateros, *Sacrum Armamentarium: Pars prima*, ed. by A. Bucossi (*Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca* 75), Turnhout 2014.

cossi's forthcoming survey of the use and format of the dialogue in the discussions of the *Filioque* question in the twelfth century, Hugo and Kamateros appear to be influenced by the dialogues of Anselm of Havelberg, compiled ca. 1150,²⁶ and Niketas of Maroneia's *Sex dialogi de processione Spiritus sancti*.²⁷ The four texts are considered to be the foremost sources of information on the theological and doctrinal discussions in the Byzantine empire on the *Filioque* question in the century after the schism of 1054.

Hugo went back to Italy some time after the publication of *De sancto et immortali Deo* and never returned to Constantinople, while his brother Leo Tuscus continued his imperial engagement for a number of years. In Rome Hugo was received by Pope Alexander III, to whom he had sent a version of his *De sancto et immortali Deo* along with a dedicatory letter; Pope Lucius III appointed him *diaconus cardinalis sancti Angeli* shortly before his death in autumn 1182. Hugo thus outlived his Byzantine benefactor Manuel Comnenos, who died on September 24, 1180, and must have learnt of the massacre in the Latin (Italian) colony in Constantinople, which took place there in spring 1182, and was initiated by Manuel's successor Andronikos, due partly to a growing disapproval of Manuel's too friendly attitude towards the Western church. Whether Hugo's treatise played any significant role in this change of imperial attitude still needs to be investigated, but the massacre put an end to the efforts of Manuel Comnenos to make the twain churches meet.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Andronikos Kamateros, *Sacrum Armamentarium: Pars prima*, ed. by A. Bucossi (Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 75), Turnhout 2014.
 Augustinus, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV*, ed. by R. Willems, (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 36), 2nd ed., Turnhout 1990.
 Basil of Ohrid, *Dialogi Anselmi Havelbergensis episcopi*, ed. by J. Schmidt, Munich 1901.
 Hugo Eterianus, *De sancto et immortali Deo*, (Patrologia Latina 202, coll. 227–396), Paris 1855.
 Hugo Eterianus, *De minoritate et aequalitate filii hominis ad Deum Patrem*, ed. by P. Podolak and A. Zago, in: *Revue des Études Byzantines* 74 (2016), 77–170.

Secondary Sources

Bucossi, A. (2012). "Dibattiti teologici alla corte di Manuele Comneno". In: *Vie per Bizanzio: VII Congresso dell'Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini, Venezia 25–28 novembre 2009*. Ed. by A. Rigo, A. Babuin, and M. Trizio. Bari, pp. 312–314.

²⁶ Basil of Ohrid, *Dialogi Anselmi Havelbergensis episcopi*, ed. by J. Schmidt, Munich 1901.

²⁷ Bucossi 2016. I am grateful to Bucossi for sending me her introduction to Niketas "of Maroneia".

Bucossi, A. (2016). "The six dialogues of Niketas 'of Maroneia': A Contextualising Introduction". In: *Dialogue and Debate from Late Antiquity to Late Byzantium*. Ed. by A. Cameron and N. Gaul. Burlington, pp. 137–152.

Classen, P. (1955). "Das Konzil von Konstantinopel 1166 und die Lateiner". In: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 48, pp. 339–368.

Dondaine, A. (1952). "Hugues Éthérier et Léon Toscan". In: *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* 19, pp. 67–134.

Dondaine, A. (1958). "Hugues Éthérier et le concile de Constantinople de 1166". In: *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77, pp. 473–483.

Hussey, J. M. (2010). *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*. Oxford.

Mango, C. (1963). "The Conciliar Edict of 1166". In: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 17, pp. 315–330.

Podolak, P. and A. Zago (2016). "Ugo Eteriano e la controversia cristologica del 1166: edizione dell'opuscolo 'De minoritate'. Appendice: edizione della lettera ad Alessio". In: *Revue des Études Byzantines* 74, pp. 77–170.

Christian W. Kappes

Gregorios Palamas' Reception of Augustine's Doctrine of the Original Sin and Nicholas Kabasilas' Rejection of Aquinas' Maculism as the Background to Scholarios' Immaculism

Introduction

Georgios-Gennadios Scholarios (c. 1400–c. 1472) is a pivotal figure for Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism.¹ He is best known for his role as the first Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople after the capture of the city by the Turks in 1453. During his occupation of the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, he was responsible for re-organizing the Orthodox Church to ensure its survival under unfavorable conditions of Islam.² Before becoming Patriarch of Constantinople, Scholarios had been favorably disposed toward a brokered union with the Latins during the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439).³ Later, during these conciliar debates, Scholarios abandoned Florence prior to the public signing of the papal bull of union on July 6, 1439.⁴ Upon return to Constantinople, Scholarios gradually changed his conciliatory attitude toward Latins and allied with his abecedary and spiritual Father, Markos of Ephesus (1392–1445). After receiving the endorsement of Markos Eugenikos or “The Ephesine,” Scholarios took up leadership of the Byzantine resistance party or *Holy Synaxis* that ultimately ensured the independent existence and operation of the Orthodox Church in the late fifteenth century and beyond.⁵ For his part, Markos of Ephesus ranks among the most outstanding personalities in the history of the Orthodox Church for his singular opposition to the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439).

In Latin literature, Scholarios often served a romantically apologetic purpose to promote Catholic-Orthodox unity. Scholarios’ professed admiration for Thomas Aquinas led some influential Roman Catholic authors to infer need for universal hegemony of Thomistic philosophy and theology in the realm of Orthodox-Catholic dialogue à propos the Scholarian corpus. In recent times, this romanticism instead served to distance contemporary Orthodox thinkers from Scholarios as a “Latin-thinker.” In reality, Scholarios was idiosyncratic, employing substantially eclectic

¹ For his life and times, see Blanchet 2008a.

² Blanchet 2001a, 60–72.

³ Jugie 1937, 65–86; Turner 1967, 83–103.

⁴ Gill 1959, 301.

⁵ Blanchet 2008a, 383–443.

predilections in his expression of Orthodoxy. Today, Scholarios still tends to be collated (without sufficient nuance) under the static heading of “Thomist” according to secondary literature.

Scholarios’ approach to Thomism cannot be identified with coeval, Renaissance Thomism of the Italian reformed *studia* from the early 1430s onwards.⁶ Scholarios began his philosophical career as an eclectic philosopher affirming (contra Aquinas) the modist philosopher-theologian Radulphus Brito.⁷ The *modista* Brito shared some common values with Aquinas (even being misidentified as a Thomist in Renaissance literature), but less than many eclectic Thomists of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Following the Council of Florence, Scholarios interpolated various opinions into his translation of Armandus of Bellovisu’s commentary on the *De ente et essentia*, some of which were Scotistic in nature and irreconcilable to Aquinas.⁸ Scholarios never contemplated rejection or depreciation of Aquinas. Nonetheless, as Scholarios continued to write, he philosophized in an eclectic manner, all the while claiming Aquinas as his master. Environmental and historical factors surrounding Scholarios’ intellectual formation sufficiently explain his philosophical and theological eclecticism, as well as his comfort with adopting Aquinas. Similarly, Scholarios’ approach to Mariology proves to be a synthesis of Thomistic and Byzantine approaches. Nonetheless, Scholarios’ *conclusions* in Mariology substantially reject Aquinas’ historical judgment on Mary’s holiness. Nevertheless, Scholarios never withdrew his reverence from Aquinas.

In this study, I will investigate Scholarian tenets in Mariology. I plan on demonstrating that Scholarios’ overall vocabulary and values remained faithful to the Mariology of contemporary and anterior Orthodox authors. Even so, Scholarios simultaneously incorporated Augustinian and Scholastic texts into a Mariological synthesis. Scholarios’ instructors had already provided him with such horizons. After all, Gregorios Palamas, Makarios Makres, Joseph Bryennios, and Markos of Ephesus had

⁶ Kappes 2013b, 71–114.

⁷ Kappes 2013b, 86–91.

⁸ Scholarios’ eclectic Thomism, similar to fourteenth-century Thomists (before the onset of a more stringent Renaissance Italian Thomism of the Dominican *studia*), does not negate multiple encomia of Aquinas as collected in Demetracopoulos’ *Grundriss*. Scholarios’ reverence and reference to Aquinas did keep him away from significant doctrinal and philosophical deviations. See the Scholarian epitome of Aquinas’ *SG* in OCGS, V *Preface*, p. 2, 1–20, wherein he admits that Aquinas’ *filioque* and essence-energies doctrine (viz., Akindynism) constitute the only two irreconcilable differences between Aquinas and the Greek Church. See Scholarios’ youthful translation of Radulphus Brito (*On Porphyry’s Isagoge*) in OCGS, VII 12, p. 78, 1–33, wherein Scholarios approvingly translated Brito’s metaphysically critical position of Aquinas on *materia signata*. Scholarios maintained this position in his essence-energies treatises of the 1450s, as in OCGS, VI 53, pp. 236, 2–38, 237, 1–4. See also Scholarios, *De processione prima*, OCGS, II 6, p. 18, 7–26, wherein Scholarios accused Aquinas of falsely distorting Damascene into a Nestorian to extort acquiescence of the Greeks to the *filioque*. See Scholarios, *De processione secunda*, OCGS, II 23, p. 377, 20–30, wherein Scholarios bade Orthodox to flee from Aquinas’ doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Citations against Aquinas’ pneumatology can be multiplied.

already taken up the task of synthesizing in varying degrees both/either Augustine and/or Scholasticism with Orthodox theology. Scholarios marked the culmination of this practice on a scale that was unprecedented in Byzantium. In this vein, part of the present investigation will provide proofs of utilization of Augustinian and Scholastic texts among Scholarios' predecessors to determine the degree of Scholarios' innovation.

My conclusions prove that, though Scholarios' Mariology fell into the realm of immaculatism or support for theological axioms in line with the Scotistic *theologoumenon* of the Immaculate Conception contra Aquinas or maculism, Scholarios did not in fact arrive at his conclusions by only Latin sources. Instead, Scholarios' Byzantine sensibilities took into account the recent introduction of the Latin debate into the East, while his Orthodox teachers supplied him with Greek Fathers in Mariology. In fine, Scholarios represents a Byzantine immaculatism in reaction to Latin maculism or assertions that Mary inherited original sin. It will be argued that Scholarios' synthesis constitutes an irenic response to maculist Thomism in line with his Orthodox predecessors who consistently resisted Thomistic Mariology in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Byzantium.

1 Roman Catholic Scholars, Scholarios, and Immaculate Conception

Jugie (1878–1954) ranked among the earliest scholars to study Scholarios' doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.⁹ Naturally, Jugie enjoyed a certain *gravitas* on matters related to Scholarios after editing and publishing his *opera omnia* (1928–1935). Jugie's arguments and conclusions still delimit the *status quaestionis* of Scholarios' Mariology.¹⁰ Jugie initially focused on Scholarios' homily (1464) *Homélie sur la Dormition de la Sainte Vierge*:

Scot lui-même n'était pas pour lui un inconnu. Sa pensée sur l'Immaculée Conception de la Mère de Dieu n'en présente, de ce chef. [Aquin], que plus d'intérêt [...] C'est [Immaculate Conception] pourquoi elle aussi, bien qu'engendrée suivant les lois ordinaires, fut, par un privilège de la grâce divine, préserve de la tache originelle.¹¹

Jugie proposed several points in favor of Scholarian Scotism: (1.) Mary's conception is an “exemption from the common laws” of nature,¹² (2.) Mary's conception is “a priv-

⁹ V. Laurent 1953, 21.

¹⁰ Recent literature attempting to contribute to Byzantine Mariology republishes excerpts of Jugie's commentary on the Scholarian corpus. For example, see Toniolo 2008, 565–578.

¹¹ Jugie 1914, 527–528.

¹² Jugie 1914, 528.

ilege of divine grace,”¹³ (3.) Jesus’ and Mary’s conceptions differ: (a.) Jesus is sinless “by nature,” (b.) Mary is sinless “by grace” via a divine act of “preservation,”¹⁴ and (4.) Mary contracts the *debitum peccati* (whether *debitum proximum* or *remotum* is ambiguous and anachronistic).¹⁵ After publishing these findings, Jugie reproduced these arguments nearly verbatim in *Patrologia Orientalis* (1922) in a preface to the critical text of Scholarios’ sermon *Homélie sur la Dormition de la Sainte Vierge*.¹⁶

Following publication of two (of three) of Scholarios’ extant Marian sermons, Jugie then published subsequent volumes to Scholarios’ *opera omnia* (1928–1936).¹⁷ Simultaneously, Jugie was publishing volumes on the dogmatics of the Oriental Orthodox and Eastern Orthodox theology (1923–1935).¹⁸ Jugie’s preface to Scholarios’ three Marian sermons,¹⁹ as well as his Scholarian notes on the Immaculate Conception, varied little from 1914–1935.²⁰ Shortly before his death (d. 1954), Jugie proffered his mature analysis of Scholarios’ immaculatism:²¹

- 1) Christ is immaculate in virtue of virginal conception, while Mary is immaculate in virtue of her divine maternity.²²
- 2) Mary was granted an exemption in view of her son’s more glorious coming.
- 3) The Scotist-Franciscan François Meyronnes (*ante* 1288–1328) is a probable Scholastic source for Scholarios.²³

Jugie referenced four pericopes: (1.) The sermon *Sermon pour la fête de l’Annonciation*,²⁴ (2.) The sermon *Sermon pour la fête de la Présentation*,²⁵ (3.) The sermon *Homélie sur la Dormition de la Sainte Vierge*, and²⁶ (4.) *Second traité sur l’origine de l’âme*.²⁷

Afterwards, Roman Catholic Mariologists typically recycled his conclusions.²⁸ Uniquely, Fehlner has recently suggested that the essential theological preambles and metaphysics constitutive of the Immaculate Conception mirror constant historical elements endemically present within the whole of the Byzantine Mariological

¹³ Jugie 1914, 528.

¹⁴ Jugie 1914, 529.

¹⁵ Jugie 1914, 529.

¹⁶ Jugie 1922, 570.

¹⁷ OCGS, I–VIII. For updated lists of Scholarios’ works, see Tinnefeld 2002e, 493–533, and *Grundriss*.

¹⁸ Jugie 1923–1935, I–V.

¹⁹ OCGS, I, pp. xlii–xliv.

²⁰ Jugie 1923–1935, vol. I, p. 467.

²¹ Jugie 1952, 301–307.

²² Jugie 1952, 305.

²³ Jugie 1952, 302.

²⁴ OCGS, I 42–43, 46, p. 41, 12–35, p. 45, 1–34.

²⁵ OCGS, I 4, p. 164, 26–35, p. 165, 1–8, p. 166, 30–37, p. 167, 1–16.

²⁶ OCGS, I 8, p. 202, 14–37, p. 203, 1–3.

²⁷ OCGS, I 20, p. 501, 8–37.

²⁸ Gordillo 1954, 126–237, Eldarov 1955, 183–184, Fehlner 2007, 242, Toniolo 2008, 565–566.

tradition. Where Jugie and his (begrudging) Orthodox followers saw Scholarios' Mariology as a mere import from the West, Fehlner proffered an interpretation, where Scholarios is the *culmination* of the tradition of Byzantine Mariology prior to the fall of the Polis.²⁹ Comparing Maximos Confessor and Gregorios Palamas to Scotistic thought, Fehlner underlines their shared vision of the absolute primacy of Christ. Orthodox scholars have also underlined Christological parallels between Scotus and Maximos concerning the Trinitarian predestination of the Incarnation in the divine mind prior to any consideration of sin.³⁰

2 Orthodox Scholars, Scholarios, and Immaculate Conception

Modern Orthodox scholars distance themselves from the Immaculate Conception for a number of reasons. First, for some, an exemption from original sin allegedly excludes Mary from the common human nature.³¹ Secondly, for others, the Immaculate Conception is objectionable because of supposed confusion among Latins on the effects of original sin.³² If some Orthodox reject Latin formulations of original sin, Lossky supposed that the Augustinian *hereditas damnosa* resulted from original sin.³³ For him, Adamite inheritance of sin and “guilt” cursed Mary.³⁴ When objecting to the Immaculate Conception, Lossky generally failed to provide his reader with patristic references for his position contra.³⁵ Bulgakov argued for Mary's necessary share in original sin because it allegedly impedes communication of a true humanity to Christ.³⁶ Somehow, sinless conception negatively separates a human being from “humanity.”³⁷ Schmemann acknowledged that some Orthodox theologians had taught the rough equivalent of the Immaculate Conception as a *theologoumenon* and opined that an “anti-Roman reflex” constituted a substantial component of modern Orthodoxy's opposition to the Immaculate Conception. He concluded his analysis by verifying the permis-

²⁹ Fehlner 2007, 241.

³⁰ Florovsky 1976, 168–170, Bucur 2008, 199–215.

³¹ Fehlner 2007, 252–254.

³² Augustinian, Anselmian, Thomistic, Bonaventurian, and Scotistic theories on original sin competed in the marketplace of ideas during all Scholastic periods. Nobody at the Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence knew one theory as dogma. For the Council of Trent later proposing a compromise formula between Thomists and Scotists, see Alberigo, II, pp. 665–667 (Trent, *Session V: Decretum super peccato originali*).

³³ Lossky 1978, 79–94.

³⁴ Lossky 1974c, 100, 204.

³⁵ Lossky 1976, 140–142.

³⁶ Nichols 2005, 58–63.

³⁷ Bulgakov 1988, 117.

sibility of the *opinio theologica* as in Scholarios. Nevertheless, Schmemann seconded Meyendorff's supposition about Catholic-Orthodox differences on the "Latin dogma" of original sin.³⁸ Lastly, Gillet warmly embraced the *theologoumenon* of the Immaculate Conception, arguing that saintly and learned Orthodox churchmen, as an ancient and pious rule, embraced the doctrine.³⁹ Be that as it may, I investigate the mainline objections in the present study.

Meyendorff supposed that Scholarios was an idiosyncratically Orthodox theologian in taking a position equivalent to Pope Pius IX's (1854) definition of the Immaculate Conception.⁴⁰ Meyendorff referred to Scholarios deprecatively as "an isolated and nostalgic intellectual."⁴¹ Meyendorff supposed that Scholarios had been distracted with the Immaculate Conception because of "ancestral/original guilt" that allegedly engendered human reproduction since the primordial fall of Adam and Eve. Meyendorff concluded that Scholarios' doctrine of original sin is foreign to historical Orthodoxy.⁴² Meyendorff agreed with Jugie that Scholarios abandoned Thomism in an isolated instance to embrace a different Scholastic (i. e., Scotistic) opinion and further evaluated Scholarios as upholding the Thomistic doctrine of "original guilt."⁴³ Lastly, Meyendorff saw the Immaculate Conception as a violation of an allegedly universal Marian principle; namely, no Byzantine authority had ever argued or taught that Mary (like Christ) was immortal in the manner of Adam and Eve before the Fall.⁴⁴ Meyendorff's preoccupation with Mary's deathlessness was likely a reaction to Jugie and his *Dominican* sympathies concerning the putatively logical consequences of an immaculate conception. Meyendorff's writes:⁴⁵

Quotations can easily be multiplied, and they give clear indications that the Mariological piety of the Byzantines would probably have led them to accept the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary as it was defined in 1854, if only they had shared the Western doctrine of original sin.⁴⁶

Thereafter, similar to Meyendorff, Evdokimov proposed the Byzantine doctrine of "the purification of Mary" at the Annunciation as the Orthodox foil to the Immaculate Conception. Evdokimov's "Orthodox" exegesis of the purification of Mary at the Annun-

³⁸ Schmemann 1966, 200.

³⁹ Gillet 1983, 153–159.

⁴⁰ Meyendorff 1974a, 148, Meyendorff 1983, 45–46.

⁴¹ Meyendorff 1983, 46.

⁴² Meyendorff 1974a, 148.

⁴³ Meyendorff 1974a, 148.

⁴⁴ Meyendorff 1974a, 147: "Texts [about Mary] are to be understood in the context of the doctrine of original sin which prevailed in the East: the inheritance from Adam is mortality, not guilt, and there was never any doubt among Byzantine theologians that Mary was indeed a mortal being."

⁴⁵ Meyendorff 1974a, 144.

⁴⁶ Meyendorff 1974a, 148.

ciation sought to *contrast* “Orthodox” with Roman Catholic Mariology.⁴⁷ Importantly, Evdokimov failed to address Jugie’s historical account of Orthodox Mariology as first promoting a maculist exegesis of Mary’s “purification” only after the onset of the sixteenth century.⁴⁸ Instead, recent studies establish the fact that late Byzantine theologians, as Nicholas Kabasilas, explained Mary’s purification in terms of angelic “purification,” as in the Ps.-Dionysian sense, where angels (who are sinless) “purify” one another with graceful knowledge.⁴⁹ The other Byzantine strain of an entirely positive sense of purification developed from biblical and patristic interpretation of Jesus as immaculate (in a sense univocal to Mary’s humanity), while he was nonetheless “purified” at his circumcision and at his baptism.⁵⁰

Next, Romanides published a doctoral thesis on original sin, which subsequently gained considerable traction among Orthodox theologians. A central focus was to reject an allegedly Augustinian theory of original sin. By (incorrectly) assuming that medieval and contemporary Roman Catholicism officially adopted wholesale Augustinianism (with its traducian transmission of sin) in its doctrine of original sin, some camps accustomed themselves to argue that the “Immaculate Conception” demarcates an absurd thesis, for Augustine proposed a fictional condition for human nature that is consequently inapplicable to the Mary.⁵¹ Later, Zezes, as a fellow ultra-Orthodox writer, resolutely presupposed Scholarios never to have embraced the Immaculate Conception. However Zezes failed to cite a single Scholarian text or secondary source.⁵²

Recently, Livanos has paid significant attention to the Immaculate Conception in relation to Scholarios. His point of departure is taken from Meyendorff’s statement of Scholarios as “an intellectual enigma awaiting modern scholarly investigation.”⁵³ Livanos’ conclusions are limited to the following:

- 1) Scholarios was dependent on Scotus for his Mariology, in spite of his normative Thomism.

⁴⁷ Evdokimov 1979, 157.

⁴⁸ Jugie 1952, 313–314.

⁴⁹ Kappes 2014, 86–87.

⁵⁰ Candal 1962, 241–276, Kappes 2014, 17–68. For the relevant biblical verses that puzzled patristic authors, see NT 185, 188, 190: “Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παραστῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι ‘πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν ἄγιον τῷ κυρίῳ ιληθήσεται’ [Compare LXX Ex., 13, 12, LXX Lv., 12:6] [...] Καὶ ἥλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν (τὴν) περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἀφεσιν ἄμαρτιῶν [...] καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος [...].” (Lk., 1, 22–23, Lk., 3, 3, and Lk., 3, 21).

⁵¹ Romanides 2001.

⁵² Zezes 1988, 286–287.

⁵³ Livanos’ bibliography both fails to investigate Jugie’s *capolavoro* (Jugie 1952), and neglects consulting primary Scotistic sources to arrive at his conclusions. See Livanos 2006a, 1. For numerous criticisms of the published version of this doctoral dissertation, see Blanchet 2006, 395–397.

- 2) Scholarios directly depends on Scholastic-Augustinian sources for his view of original sin.
- 3) Scholarios does not fall within the pale of traditional and authentic Orthodox theology.

Livanos did not investigate Jugie's musings on Scotists who could have served directly as Scholarios' sources. Lacking evidence of direct citations from Scotus, Jugie had suggested François Meyronnes as a decisive influence on Scholarios.⁵⁴ Regarding Scholarios' anthropology, Livanos claimed Scotus as the source for Scholarios' discussion of the Immaculate Conception because original sin is called an "inheritance" and because "ancestral/original guilt" passed from one generation to the next. Developing Meyendorff, Livanos accuses Scholarios of Latinizing when arguing the mortality and death of the Mary from "fittingness" (as opposed to fallen nature or to sin).⁵⁵ Livanos impugns Scholarios' Orthodoxy under the aegis of Yannaras, who thinks that Scholarios was divorced from both his own psyche and Orthodoxy:

[Scholarios] lives in the heart of Hellenism, in Constantinople, assumes responsibility as chief pastor of the subjugated Greeks, and is himself radically de-Hellenized, unaware of the crucial and fundamental elements of the Greek spiritual tradition.⁵⁶

The dependency on Yannaras is of questionable worth since the philosopher has neither produced a monograph, nor general research on Scholarios. Livanos continues his evaluation of Scholarios by recourse to Photios the Great:

In the passage where Scholarios argues in favor of the Immaculate Conception, he wholeheartedly embraces everything we have just heard his distant predecessor Photios condemn. Scholarios uses terms like προγονική ἐνοχή "ancestral guilt," and προγονική ἀμαρτία "ancestral sin," expressing concepts clearly repugnant to Photios. That Scholarios believed sin was accounted to man by nature and not by reasoning or choice is apparent in his statement that Ss. Joachim and Anna, "though irreproachable in virtue...nonetheless shared in the inheritance [viz., κλῆρος]." Scholarios writes of sin as a κλῆρος while Photios, using a word derived from the same root, denounces the teaching that sin was "inherited," ἐκληρώσατο.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Livanos 2006a, 135–45, Jugie 1952, 140, 305. Livanos fails to note Scholarios' praise of François Meyronnes. Scholarios declared Scotus and Meyronnes (among Franciscans) to rank among the last Latin theologians to maintain the patristic tradition in OCGS, II, p. 223 and OCGS, VI, p. 179–180.

⁵⁵ Livanos 2006a, 1–2. But one exception invalidates this alleged universal. For example, see the series of items listed as "it was ought that, etc." in Damasc., *Dorm.*, V 2, 15, ed. B. Kotter, Berlin 1988, p. 530, 11–15 (Engl. tr. by B. Daley, Crestwood, NY 1998, p. 218): "ώσπερ τὸ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ ἐνυποστάν σῶμα τὸ ἄγιον καὶ ἀκίρατον τῇ τρίτῃ τοῦ μνήματος ἔχανιστατο, οὕτως ταύτην τὴν προσφιλῆ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀναφέρεοθαι [...] σκηνήν [...]"

⁵⁶ Yannaras 2006, 89; Livanos 2006a, 9.

⁵⁷ Livanos 2006a, 41.

Livanos' summarily affirms the judgments of these two authors who comment on Scholarios' lack of an Orthodox pedigree. Further reason for rejection of Scholarios' theology is based on comparisons with passages from Chrysostom and Photios. Therafter, Livanos excludes Scholarios from Orthodoxy on the question of Mary and original sin. Below, we will discover not a few inaccuracies in Livanos' premises based upon Greek vocabulary. Still, some of Livanos' reactions against "original guilt" and Augustinian traducianism coincide with the overall picture of pre- and post-Augustinian Byzantium.⁵⁸ In short, from this survey of scholars interested in Mariology and Scholarios, only Jugie appears to have engaged the Scholarian corpus in any profound way.

3 Gregorios Palamas and Augustine on Original Sin

Nearly two decades have passed since Flogaus and Demetracopoulos uncovered multiple passages proving Palamas' (limited) Augustinianism.⁵⁹ Each located exact passages or near-exact citations where Palamas latently employed Augustine's *De Trinitate* in his *150 Chapters*, *Homily 16*, and letter *ad Xenem monialem*.⁶⁰ Following their philological and theological presentation of the facts, scholars scrutinized their assertions.⁶¹ Today leading Orthodox scholars accept the fact that Palamas approvingly employed Augustinian theology (*mutatis mutandis*) and took steps to synthesize it with Byzantine theological tradition.⁶² If Palamas failed to name his Augustinian source explicitly, he obliquely referred to Augustine as "that wise and apostolic man."⁶³ Palamas supplied Augustine with a *nihil obstat* in the subsequent Palamite school.

In this vein, I will be discussing several Augustinian passages within Palamas' *opera* that treat original sin. These easily explain why posterior Palamites made expansive use of Augustine in their theological projects. Propitiously, Palamas discussed original sin in two of the three works (mentioned above) already shown to contain latent citations from Augustine's *De Trinitate*:

Many people perhaps blame Adam for the way he was easily persuaded by the evil counselor and rejected the divine commandment and through such a rejection procured our death. But it is not the same thing to want a taste of some deadly plant prior to testing it and to desire to eat of it after learning by the test that it is deadly. For a man who takes in some poison after testing it and wretchedly brings death upon himself is more culpable than the one who does this

⁵⁸ For the overall rejection of traducianism among Byzantines, see Congourdeau 2007, 268–269.

⁵⁹ Flogaus 1996b, 275–297; Flogaus 1997b; J. A. Demetracopoulos 1997.

⁶⁰ Flogaus, 1996, 294–296.

⁶¹ Lössl 2000, 267–295.

⁶² Louth 2013, 115–123.

⁶³ Trizio 2006, 160.

and suffers the consequences prior to the test. Many people perhaps blame Adam for the way he was easily persuaded by the evil counselor and rejected the divine commandment and through such rejection procured death [...] Therefore, each of us is more abundantly to be blamed and condemnable (κατάκριτος) to death than Adam [for sinning after knowing that Adam's fruit is poisonous]. But is that tree [of the garden commandment] not within us? Do we not, even now, have a commandment from God forbidding us to taste of it? [...] On the one hand, if we obey it and set our will to live by it, it frees us from the punishment for all our sins and from the ancestral imprecation and condemnation (τῆς προγονικῆς ἀρᾶς καὶ καταδίκης).⁶⁴

Palamas' statement that death is an effect of Adam's ancestral sin is hardly innovative. Quite diverse is the case with "ancestral/original imprecation" that constitutes a neologism. Whereas Scriptures refer to Christ as one under a "curse" (κατάρα), neither Byzantine patristic literature, nor the NT, makes use of the technical expression "ancestral imprecation."⁶⁵ I render ἀρά as "imprecation" to denote a malediction originating from a moral being outside of the cursed person. "Curse" denotes habitual misfortune attached to a person, group of persons, or a thing. Within this genus falls an imprecation, which denotes a spoken malediction that affects the loss of some good due to the cursing agent's power over the object of the imprecation. Granted Palamas' general avoidance of humanistic niceties, stylistic considerations are inauspicious to explain the neologism. Yet another Augustinian-influenced homily of Palamas, already proven by Flogaus and Demetracopoulos to contain passages from the *De Trinitate*, further strengthens my thesis:

The grace [...] came to dwell in the baptismal water, such that when it touched those baptized later following his example, they would be divinely regenerated, and mystically renewed and recreated in such a way that they would no longer be from the ancient Adam and so attract the curse (έκ τοῦ παλαιοῦ Αδὰμ [...] ἔλκειν τὴν ἀράν). Instead they would be from the New Adam and so have God's blessing [...]

Just as through one man, Adam, liability [to punishment] to death passed down by heredity to those born afterwards (τοὺς μεταγενεστέρους προγονικῶς⁶⁶), so the grace of

64 Palam., *CL*, 55, ed. R. Sinkewicz, Toronto 1982, p. 150, 1–16 (Engl. tr. by Sinkewicz, Toronto 1982, p. 149). I alter Sinkewicz's "culpable" (μεμπτέος) and "guilty" (κατάκριτος). These carry inaccurate connotations of a personal sense of fault or feeling of being unjust. Palamas pairs extrinsic imputation of "fault" (with an attached punishment) and "condemnation" from God with Adam's inheritance. Palamas' holds a dual extrinsic sense of an "ancestral curse" and "condemnation." Ergo, imputed fault is paired with a curse, while a condemnable man is paired with the decree of his condemnation.

65 Gal., 3, 13–14. The indices of Palamas' *opera omnia* show him citing exhaustively from a Maximian work explaining the former's understanding of κατάρα. See Maxim., *Qu. ad Thal.*, I 5, ed. C. Laga and C. Steel, Turnhout 1980, p. 65, 27–28: "Η μᾶλλον γῇ τοῦ Αδάμ ἐστιν ἡ καρδία, κατάραν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τὴν τῶν οὐρανίων ἀγαθῶν ἀφαιρεσιν."

66 This phrase is exclusive to Palamas and Plandunes according to the TLG. Compare Planudes 13, 12, 16.

eternal and heavenly life passed down from the one divine and human Word to all those born again of Him.⁶⁷ [...]

The grace of Baptism, which is called the washing of regeneration, inaugurates this action in us, providing remission of all our sins and [the remission] of the responsibility [for punishment] from the imprecation ($\tau\eta\varsigma \epsilon\kappa \tau\eta\varsigma \alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma \epsilon\nu\theta\bar{\nu}\eta\varsigma$).⁶⁸

Palamas' homily in English auspiciously refers to $\epsilon\nu\theta\bar{\nu}\eta\varsigma$ as "liability" to some kind of punishment, so that $\epsilon\nu\theta\bar{\nu}\eta\varsigma$ should not be understood in harmony with fifth-century reception of Augustine among Latin Fathers, that is, with *post-Augustinian reception* (also influencing Planudes' vocabulary) of "legal guilt." It is fairly obvious that the lexical sense and context of the Latin does not allow for any intrinsic or personal imputation of an unspecified guilt (*culpa*) to a son or daughter of Adam for a progenitor's sin. Instead, Palamas had to reconcile the Greek version of Augustine, as a patrologist, to the Greek Fathers and likely coined part of his newfangled phraseology from odd vocabulary where a Byzantine Father occasionally combined the concept of group "responsibility" with an imprecation and a curse. While there are hints of similar vocabulary in Chrysostom⁶⁹ as well as in Maximos the Confessor,⁷⁰ neither of them can be used to explain Palamas' innovative terminology. For his part, Palamas writes:

Before Christ we all shared that same ancestral imprecation ($\pi\text{ρογονικ}\eta\varsigma \alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma$) and common condemnation ($\kappa\text{oνην καταδίκην}$) poured out ($\chi\text{υθεῖσαν}$) on all of us from our single forefather, as if it had sprung ($\alpha\text{ναδιδομένην}$) from the root of the human race ($\rho\text{i\zetaης τοῦ γένους}$)⁷¹ and was the common inheritance of our nature ($\tau\eta\varsigma \varphi\text{ύσει συγκεκλη-$

⁶⁷ *Homiliae*, IX 16, 16–17, p. 444, 4–10, 18–21 (Engl. tr. by C. Veniamin, S. Canaan, PA 2014, pp. 122). All the homilies have as yet to be more precisely datable to a *Terminus post quem* 1350. See *Homiliae*, IX, pp. 16–24.

⁶⁸ *Homiliae*, IX 16, 34, p. 470, 11–13 (Engl. tr. p. 130). I have changed Veniamin's translation, which formerly read: "the guilt of the curse." This reads pre- and post-Augustinian vocabulary of Latin Fathers and Latino-patristic development of "guilt" into Palamas' text. Just as Palamas, Augustine *latinus* himself assiduously avoided "guilt."

⁶⁹ Near-semantic equivalency occurred between $\kappa\text{ατάρα}$ and $\alpha\rho\alpha$ in Chrysosom (glossing Gal., 3, 13). Hebrews under the $\alpha\rho\alpha$ suffered as $\kappa\text{ατάραι τοῦ νόμου}$. Christ then became a $\kappa\text{ατάρα ἐπικατάρατος}$ for everyone's sake. People as a whole are $\overset{\circ}{\lambda}\alpha\dot{\alpha}\overset{\circ}{\nu} \overset{\circ}{\nu}\pi\text{ε}\overset{\circ}{\nu}\theta\bar{\nu}\eta\varsigma$ and Christ dissolved their curse on a tree. See Chrysos. *Comm. ad Galat.*, III 3 [698], Paris 1859, col. 652 (Engl. tr. by E.P. Pusey, Oxford 1840, pp. 55–56).

⁷⁰ For Maximos God's imprecation ($\overset{\circ}{\eta} \alpha\rho\alpha$) was sent on earth because of trespass ($\tau\eta\varsigma \pi\text{αραβάσεως}$). This trespass brought about a curse ($\kappa\text{ατάρα}$). While the first curse was brought on by free will, the subsequent curse on all humans is death. See Maxim. *Qu. ad Thal.*, II 62, p. 123, 129–144.

⁷¹ For Adam as "root of the human race," see Cyril, *In xii proph.*, II 3, 2, ed. P.E. Pusey, Oxford 1868, p. 125, 5–6. Palamas' concept is imperfectly and uniquely foreshadowed, if only partially, in Cyr., *Frag. ad Roman.*, III 5, 13, ed. P.E. Pusey, Oxford 1872, p. 183, 21–29, p. 185, 4–6 (Translation mine): "[Scholion on Rm., 5, 13–16:] Yet, if this, in a certain mode, he says: someone would have prevailed on them upon the earth and death prior to the Law. Since if also some did not become guilty ($\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}\nu\text{οχοί}$) of the Law through deviations ($\pi\text{αραβάσεσιν}$) [...] They nonetheless underwent, too, destruction ($\tau\eta\varsigma \varphi\text{θοράν}$)

ρωμένην).⁷² Each person's individual action attracted either reproof or praise from God, but no one could do anything about the common imprecation and condemnation, or the evil inheritance (πονηρὸν κλῆρον)⁷³ that had been passed down to him and through him would pass to his descendants.

Yet, Christ came, setting human nature free and changing the common curse into a shared blessing. He took upon himself our liable (ἐπεύθυνον) nature from the most pure Virgin and united it, new and unmixed with a ancient seed (παλαιοῦ σπέρματος),⁷⁴ to his Divine Person. He rendered it unaccountable (ἀνεύθυνον) and righteous, so that all his spiritual descendants would remain outside the ancestral imprecation and condemnation.⁷⁵

Upon surveying patristic literature, no Fathers appear to designate Adam's sin as a "root-infection" that flows like "seed" into the rest of a metaphorical plant or human race.⁷⁶ Shocking is Palamas' singular notion of an "evil inheritance." Palamas omi-

with respect to a similitude of the deviation (τῆς παραβάσεως) of Adam [...] A similitude as if one might say: Death happened – in the likeness of Adam – to run unto his entire race (πᾶν γένος), as if damage unto a root (βλάβος εἰς ρίζαν). After the plant suffered (φυτοῦ παθόντος) it, as if the whole suffered, its branches necessarily must become wasted away (μαραίνεσθαι) [...] Now, if indeed, says he, 'the punishment (κατάκριμα) of one or through one Adam caused cessation for all according to his likeness,' it was since as a root, as he said, it was causing the suffering of the race unto destruction."

72 Palamas likely adopted his unusual phraseology and concept of inheritance from Planud., *Ep. 121*, 49–51, ed. P.L.M. Leone, Amsterdam 1991, p. 214: "καὶ γάρ πέπονθεν ὁ παῖς, ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ μὲν ἔπαθον, οἱ δὲ πείσονται, πάθος ἐκ τῆς τοῦ προπάτορος ἀμαρτίας τῇ φύσει συγκληρωθέν, κοινότατον παντὶ τῷ γένει κάκι τῶν Ἰσων ἐπιὸν ἄπασιν."

73 Aug. and Planud., *περὶ Τριάδος*, II 13, 16, 21, ed. M. Παπαθωμόπουλος, I. Τσαβαρή, and G. Rigotti, Athens 1995, p. 757, 88–98 (Engl. tr. by E. Hill, New York 1991, pp. 360–361): "[Gloss on Rm., 5, 12:] He discusses the two men at some length; one, that same first Adam through whose sin and death all of us his liable descendants (ἀπόγονοι ὑπεύθυνοι) have been tied up from a kind of hereditary evil (ἀπὸ κληρονομίας κακοῖς); the other the second Adam who is not only man but also God, and who pays for us a debt he did not owe (ώφειλεν). With the result that we have been set free from debts, both ancestral ones (ἐκ τῶν πατρών ὄφλημάτων) and our personal ones (τῶν ιδίων ἡλευθερώθημεν), which we do owe. So then, just as on that one man's account the devil held in his power all who have been born from that man's vitiated fleshly concupiscence (διὰ τῆς σαρκικῆς ἐπιθυμίας), it only fair that on the account of this one man he should release all of them who have been reborn through this man's untarnished spiritual grace."

74 This is probably an oblique reference to Aug. and Planud., *περὶ Τριάδος*, II 11, 2, 5, p. 605, 159 Παπαθωμόπουλος / Τσαβαρή / Rigotti (Engl. tr. p. 307): "Offspring frequently reveal the caprices of their mothers, and what they have looked at with peculiar pleasure. The more tender are the first stages of the embryo (σπερμάτων ἀρχαί), and the more formable if I may so put it, the more receptively and effectually do they reflect the intention of the mother's soul and the image produced in it by the body it has greedily gaped at." There are many such instances that could be mentioned [He mentions the patriarch Jacob in Gn., 30, 37].

75 *Homiliae*, IX 5, 1–2, p. 142, 1–11, p. 144, 1–5 (Engl. tr. p. 34).

76 Augustinian traducianism, along with a post-Augustinian and Latino-patristic sense of transmitted guilt (for Palamas: transmitted responsibility), are not found in Maximos' system per Boojamra 1976, 24–25, 27.

nously alluded to Augustine's designation of the children of wrath as a virtual *hereditas damnosa* or *obnoxia*.⁷⁷ Palamas' viscerally carnal metaphor of ancient-infected seed of Adam easily fits into the North African mold of Augustine and Fulgentius of Ruspe, the latter of whom became available in Greek (via Demetrios Kydones) shortly after Palamas' death.⁷⁸

Palamas connected this ancient seed to any inheritor (κληρονόμος)⁷⁹ of the fall (πτωίσματος), who is cleansed in baptism, contrasting this to the New Man taken from the flesh of virginal Mary.⁸⁰ Similarly, Palamas' correspondent and friend Nicholas Kabasilas –also relying upon Augustinian ideas – boldly referred to baptism of human bodies and souls who inherit (κληρονομῆσαι) something of the first Adam as formed into “the ancient man” (παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος). For Kabasilas, post-lapsarian humans are products of the “seed of evil” (σπέρμα κακίας) flowing from their ancestors (προγόνων).⁸¹ Here, North African hamarteology seems to manifest itself.⁸² Outliving Palamas (d. 1357), Kabasilas lived long enough perhaps to utilize additional trans-

⁷⁷ See Berger 1953, 485, where “damned inheritance” is a legal term in Roman law (mentioned in Gaius) regarding someone’s heredity, where debt (versus wealth) passes from father to son. In this sense, being of the patrilineal offspring is literally a “liability” versus an “asset.” See also Buckland 1931, 199, for this penalty (with its associated concept) was eliminated in Byzantium under Justinian, so that Byzantine law made an inheritor liable for only actually existing assets of the paternal debtor. Diversely, Augustine described the debt of liability (possibly too large for one person to pay) in the human fetus as if legal quasi-guilt (*reatus*) in the Roman sense. See Cavadini and Djuth 1999, 224–227. The legal idea of damned inheritance would have been lost on Byzantine Palamas. Instead, any hypothetically legal-minded Palamas would have, at best, translated it as “worthless inheritance.” Theologically, the exceptional phrase: “wicked seed” (πονηρὸν σπέρμα) of LXX Is., 1, 4 and Is., 4, 20, might be contextually relevant by contrasting the prophetically virginal conception of Jesus with generations of those who abandoned the law of God.

⁷⁸ By “North African,” I mean a tendency in Latin and Greek ecclesiastical writers in Africa to explain LXX Ps 50 in the terms of sexual transmission of original sin. Palamas died before publication of subsequent Augustinian texts. See Koltsiou-Nikita 1999, 19–25. Fulgentius’ translation is placed *circa* 1363. Demetrios Kydones first translation of *ST*, I (1355–1358) cannot presently be classed as a candidate for influence on Palamas. See Wright 2013c, 17.

⁷⁹ *Homiliae*, XI 59, 14, p. 500, 11–13: “· καὶ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ παλαιοῦ σπέρματος φὺς καὶ κληρονόμος ὁν ἔκεινου τοῦ πτωίσματος καὶ τῆς ἐκ τούτου προστροπῆς [...]” Compare Mt., 3, 14.

⁸⁰ *Homiliae*, XI 59, 14, p. 50, 13–17. See also *Homiliae*, XI 58, 8–9, p. 466, 10–24.

⁸¹ TLG fails to locate in Greek literature this kind of designation of a fetus. In a half-dozen instances of occurrences with similar vocabulary, authors never associate Adam, sin, and baptism. See Cabas., *De vit. in Christ.*, I 2, 40, ed. M.H. Congourdeau, Paris 2009, p. 168, 1–5: [...] τοῦτό ἔστιν ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, δὲν σπέρμα κακίας ἀπὸ τῶν προγόνων λαβόντες ἅμα τῷ φύναι, οὐδεμίαν ἡμέραν καθαρὸν εἰδομεν ἀμαρτίας, οὐδὲ ἀνεπνεύσαμεν ἐλεύθεροι πονηρίας, ἀλλ’ ὁ φησιν ὁ προφήτης: “Ἄπηλλοτριώθημεν ἀπὸ μήτρας, ἐπλανήθημεν ἀπὸ γαστρός” [LXX Ps 57, 4]. Οὐ μέχρι τοῦ δυστυχοῦς ἔκεινου στάντες κλήρου τῆς προγονικῆς ἀμαρτίας οὐδὲ οἶζε κληρονομήσαμεν ἀγαπήσαντες κακοῖς [...]

⁸² Kabasilas clearly designated this as προγονικὴ ἀμαρτία in Cabas., *De vit. in Christ.*, I 2, 41, p. 168, 1 Congourdeau.

lations of the *De fide ad Petram* attributed to Augustine but really to be ascribed to Fulgentius of Ruspe.⁸³ Thus Kabasilas could have been aware of a clear imputation of fetal guilt from original sin through this Greek translation of Fulgentius who said: “faithlessness is the principle of the wicked life that took its principle from the guilt of original/ancestral sin.”⁸⁴ However, Kabasilas’ language in relation to baptism would in that case have toned down more uncomfortable assertions of Fulgentius *graecus*, who regarded children and baptism as follows:

Hold as most certain and do not doubt howsoever [...] that – whether they have begun to live in the maternal belly and die therein, or they even have already come forth therefrom out of their mothers, dying without the mystery of holy baptism – [...] babies, too, shall be sent to perpetual hell with the punishment of eternal fire. For, even if they did not also have personally the operation of sin, yet they have drawn to themselves the condemnation of original sin through carnal conception and birth (Βεβαύτατα κάτεχε καὶ κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον ἀμφίβαλλε [...] καὶ τὰ νήπια, εἴτε τὰ ἐν τῇ μητρικῇ γαστρὶ ζῆν ἀρξάμενα κάκει θνήσκοντα εἴτε καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν μητέρων ἥδη προελθόντα ἄνευ τε τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀγίου βαπτίσματος [...] κολασθήσεσθαι τῇ τοῦ αἰώνιου πυρός ἀΐδιω κολάσει. Εἰ γάρ καὶ κατ' ἴδιαν ἐνέργειαν ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔσχον, ἀλλὰ τὴν καταδίκην τοῦ προγονικοῦ ἀμαρτήματος ἐφειλκύσαντο τῇ σαρκικῇ συλλήψει τε καὶ γεννήσει).⁸⁵

Contrariwise, among the extant works of Augustine translated into Greek, Palamas could have only availed himself of *De Trinitate* with its bent toward traducianism.⁸⁶ It is at least thinkable that Palamas had access to the *SG* of Aquinas (which had been available in Greek since Christmas of 1354), but I have found no evidence of Palamas ever reading or quoting the *SG*.⁸⁷ Augustinian inspiration in Palamas appears fairly conclusive after comparing Palamas’ *Homily 52* to Augustine’s *De Trinitate* (I underline the vocabulary and phraseology shared in common by both authors):

⁸³ Kabasilas is not so dissimilar from Fulg. and Proch., *Πρὸς Πέτρον*, 16, ed. Koultsiou-Nikita, Thessaloniki 1999, p. 63, 12–20: “[...] ή σύλληψις οὐ χωρίς ἀμαρτίας ἔστιν, ὅπου τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἐπὶ τὰ νήπια οὐχ ἡ γέννησίς ἔστιν ἡ διαβιβάζουσα, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ οἰστρος [...] τὸ τῆς λαγνείας αἴσχος, ὅπερ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς δικαιοτάτης καταδίκης τοῦ πρώτου ἀμαρτήματος ἔσχον οἱ ἀνθρώποι.” This perfectly reflects Aug. and Planud, *περὶ Τριαδὸς*, II 13, 18, 23, p. 763, 28–29 Παπαθωμόπουλος/Τσαβαρή/Rigotti: “[...] αἰσθανόμεθα ὡς ἀντιμαχομένην τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός, εἰ καὶ μηδεμίᾳ ἔστι τοῦ γεννᾶν αἵτια, οἰστρον ἐπιφέρειν τῆς μίξεως [...]”

⁸⁴ Fulg. and Proch., *Πρὸς Πέτρον*, 36, p. 78, 27–29, Koultsiou-Nikita: “Τοῦ δὲ τῆς πονηρᾶς ζωῆς εἰδούς ή ἀπιστία ἀρχή, λαμβάνουσα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐνοχῆς τοῦ προγονικοῦ ἀμαρτήματος.”

⁸⁵ Fulg. and Proch., *Πρὸς Πέτρον*, 70, 27, p. 102, 1–12, Koultsiou-Nikita.

⁸⁶ Augustine’s traducianism served to explain why infants needed to be baptized, since their soul and body were products of concupiscence. See Cavadini and Djuth 1999, 42. Nevertheless, Augustine was open to alternative theories of conception, though dubious about the objective evidence thereupon. See Jones 2012, 13–18. Palamas plausibly developed Maximos Confessor’s supposition that sexual reproduction entered the world due to Adam’s fall. Conversely, human seed and its relation to its Adamite root of infection is not Maximian per Boojamra 1976, 28–29, and Larchet 2011, 150, 152–155.

⁸⁷ Papadopoulos 1967e, 25–32.

Καὶ διὰ τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ ὅφεως προσενεχθεὶς ὡς φίλος καὶ χρηστὸς σύμβουλος ὁ δεινός καὶ ὄντως ἔχθρὸς καὶ ἐπίβουλος, λαμβάνει, φεῦ!, χώραν λαθών, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀντιθέου συμβουλῆς τὴν οἰκείαν θανατηφόρον ὡς ίὸν ἐπεγχεῖ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δύναμιν. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ὁ Ἀδάμ τηνικαῦτα τῆς θείας ἐντολῆς ἀπρίξ ἀντεχόμενος ἀπεσείσατο τὴν ἀντικειμένην πονηρὰν συμβουλήν, νικητὴς ἢν ὥφθη κατὰ τοῦ ἀντιπάλου καὶ τῆς θανατηφόρου λύμης ἀνώτερος, αἰσχύνας κατὰ κράτος τὸν προσβαλόντα μανικῶς καὶ δολίως. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἐνδοὺς ἐκών, ὡς μήποτε ὥφελεν, ἡ ττήθη τε καὶ ἡχρείωται, καὶ ὃ ίζα τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς γένους ὧν καταλλήλως θνητοὺς ἀνεδίδου βλαστοὺς ἡμᾶς, ἔδει πάντως ἡμῖν, εἴπερ ἔχρην ἀναπαλαῖσαι τὴν ἡτταν καὶ τὴν νίκην ἀνακαλέσασθαι καὶ τὸν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματι θανατηφόρον ἰὸν ἀπεσείσασθαι καὶ ζωῆς αὐθίς σπάσαι καὶ ζωῆς διαιωνιζούστης τε καὶ ἀπήμονος· ἔδει τοίνυν τῷ ἡμῶν γένει ῥίζης καὶ νήσης, τουτέστι νέου Ἀδάμ οὐκ ἀναμαρτήτου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνεξαπατήτου καὶ ἀητήτου παντάπασι, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τὰς ἀμαρτίας συγχωρεῖν δυναμένου καὶ ἀνευθύνους τιθέναι τοὺς ὑπευθύνους, καὶ μὴ μόνον ζῶντος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ζωοποιούντος, ἵνα καὶ τοῖς αὐτῷ κολλωμένοις καὶ κατὰ γένος αὐτῷ προσήκουσι μεταδιδῷ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τῆς τῶν ἡμαρτημένων ἀφέσεως, οὐ τοὺς ἔξις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ νεκρωθέντας ἀναζωῶν.⁸⁸

Ἡδύνατο γάρ πάντως ὁ Θεός τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀλλαχόθεν ἀναλαβεῖν, ἐν ᾧ ἐγεγόνει ἀν μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων (1 Tim 2, 5), ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ γένους τοῦ Ἀδάμ τοῦ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἀμαρτίᾳ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένοις ὑπεύθυνον καταστήσαντος, ὥσπερ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸν δὲν πρῶτον ἐδημιούργησεν οὐκέτι γένους τινὸς ἔπλασεν [...] ἀλλὰ βέλτιον ἔκρινεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸν νικηθέντος γένους ἀναλαβεῖν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁ Θεός, δ' οὐδὲν ἀν τὸν τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου γένους ἔχθρὸν καταπολεμήσῃ· ἀνείληφε μέντοι τούτον ἐκ παρθένου ἡς τὴν σύλληψιν Πνεῦμα οὐ σάρξ, πίστις οὐκ ἐπιθυμία προέλαβεν. Οὐδὲμεσίτευσέ τις σαρκὸς ὅρεξις, δι' ἣς σπείρονται τε καὶ συλλαμβάνονται οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν προγονικήν ἐφελκόμενοι ἀμαρτίαν, ἀλλὰ ταύτης παντελῶς ἀπωκισμένης πίστει ἀλλ' οὐχὶ μίξει ἡ ἱερὰ παρθενία γόνιμος γέγονεν ὡς τὸν γεννώμενον ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης τοῦ πρώτου ἀνθρώπου πλὴν τοῦ γένους μόνον οὐ μὴν καὶ τὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἔλκειν ἀρχήν. Ἔγεννάτο γάρ οὐχὶ μολυσμῷ παραβάσεως μιανθείσης τῇ φύσεως ἀλλὰ πάντων τῶν τοιούτων μολυσμῶν μοναδικῇ θεραπείᾳ [...] ἐνικήθη ὁ τὸν πρῶτον νικητας, ἀλλὰ δι νικητὴς τοῦ πρώτου Αδάμ καὶ τὸ γένοις ἀποβαλὼν τὸ χριστώνυμον ἐλευθερωθὲν ἐκ τοῦ ανθρωπείου γένους τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἀμαρτίας διὰ τοῦ μὴ ὄντο ἐν ἀμαρτίᾳ, εἰ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα ἦν ἐκ τοῦ γένους, ὡς τὸν ἀπατεῶνα ἐκεῖνον ὑπάυτοῦ νικηθῆναι τοῦ γένους, ὅπερ ἐνίκησε τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ.⁸⁹

Planudes' translation contains significant differences from the original Latin text of Augustine. There are also important theological points derived from it. Augustine asserted:

Ex virgine cuius conceptum spiritus non caro, fides non libido praevenit. Nec interfuit carnis concupiscentia per quam seminantur et concipiuntur ceteri qui trahunt originale peccatum, sed ea penitus remotissima credendo non concumbendo sancta est secundata virginitas ut illud quod nascebatur ex propagine primi hominis tantummodo generis non et criminis originem duceret. Nascebatur namque non transgressionis contagione vitiata natura sed omnimum talium vitiorum sola medicina (Conception from a virgin was inaugurated by the Spirit not the flesh, by faith not lust. There was no desire for the flesh involved, by which the rest of men who contract original

88 *Homiliae*, XI 52, 2–3, p. 242, 3–25.

89 Aug. and Planud., *περὶ Τριαδ.*, II 13, 18, 23, p. 761, 3–20, p. 763, 38–41 Παπαθωμόπουλος/Τσαβαρή/Rigotti.

sin are begotten and conceived. It was utterly absent when the holy virginity conceived by believing, not by embracing, so that what was there born of the stock of the first man would only derive from him a racial not a criminal origin. For what was born was not a nature flawed by the infection of transgression but the only remedy and cure for all such flaws).⁹⁰

Planudes translated *propago* as ψίλα. Although Augustine did not originally employ the metaphor of a plant-root (*radix*) at this point, Planudes happened to pen a metaphor that Augustine had elsewhere embraced in similar theological context and with the same sense (cited below). Next, post-lapsarian genetic production significantly conveys a *legally* or putatively criminal lineage. Augustine clearly focused on the genital organs as the agents of propagating a flawed nature that is “infected” by the fall through conception. Humans suffer involuntary bodily motions, which did not occur before the fall. This is due either to the body itself or to the weakness of the human will. Augustine emphasized the fact that lust “fights against the law of the mind” (Rm., 7, 23). Supernaturally, to counteract this problem of the body and will, “the Virgin’s offspring was conceived” without either bodily irregularity or weakness of will. In this flesh, Jesus became “the conqueror of the first Adam, holding the human race in his power.” Formerly, “the Christian race” had been enslaved by the first Adam’s transgression. In Mary, the human race was set free from Adam’s crime by someone uninvolved in that crime. Still, Jesus was sprung from this same race. This trick deceived the deceiving devil in order to conquer him by the very race, which had long ago been conquered by crime.⁹¹

Palamas taught in *Homily 52: On the Feast of the Entry* that –in the beginning– the supremely evil spiritual serpent drew humans down to Hell. A visible snake, an enemy (έχθρός) and traitor, approached as a friend and good counselor.⁹² Satan managed to pour the deadly venom of his power into man by giving him advice against God. As Adam suffered defeat and was “the root” (ψίλα) of the human race, humanity’s progenitor produced “shoots” (βλαστούς)⁹³ subject to death. If a victory of shaking off the venom that was killing human souls and bodies were possible, it would be attained by a “new root” or New Adam, who was both sinless and completely incapable of sin. Palamas wrote: “He also had to be able to forgive sins, to make those who were subject/chargeable (ὑπευθύνους) to be unaccountable (ἀνευθύνους).⁹⁴

⁹⁰ Aug. *De Trin.*, II 13, 18, 23, ed. W.J. Mountain, Turnhout 1968, p. 413–414 (Engl. tr. pp. 361–362).

⁹¹ Aug., *De Trin.*, II 13, 18, 23, p. 763, 16–46 Mountain (Engl. tr. pp. 361–362).

⁹² Palamas appears to reference Maxim., *Qu. ad Thalassium*, II 61, p. 91, 112–115.

⁹³ Palamas associated reproductive seed with shoots as in Aug., *Περὶ Τριάδος*, I 3, 9, 19, p. 234, 74: “[...] σπερμάτων καὶ βλαστημάτων [...]”

⁹⁴ Compare *Homiliae*, XI 52, 2–3, p. 242, 21 (Engl. tr., p. 408). The English editor translated the putatively liable progeny of Adam incorrectly as “the guilty” or equivalent to Planudes’ ἔνοχοι.

4 Palamas Exempts the Theotokos from Infection

Palamas varied his vocabulary on the concept of liability (*ὑπεύθυνος/έπεύθυνος*) to punishment with respect to Adam's sin. Moving beyond the language of Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Maximos Confessor, and others, Palamas fell within the orbit of Augustine.⁹⁵ Nevertheless, Palamas assiduously avoided any hint of intrinsic *guilt* in relation to Adam's offspring, though Palamas' Adam was equally infected with the poison of the serpent.⁹⁶ For his part, Augustine always remained elusive on the legal and moral status of the infant *in utero* (a child is *reatus* but never with *culpa*) by his own choice of vocabulary. One will look in vain for any epithet of "guilty" as applied to a child born in original sin. Actually, avoiding the nondescript language of his predecessors and successors, Augustine's *De Trinitate* never designated any fetal inheritor of original sin as "guilty."⁹⁷

Whence came Palamas' purported discomfort with Augustine's guilt-laden language, if Augustine himself had never actually used *culpa*?⁹⁸ Firstly, Planudes drew out a potential legal inference from Augustine's juridical language of liability in the original Latin:

Quadam iustitia dei in potestatem diaboli traditum est genus humanum peccato primi hominis in omnes utriusque sexus commixtione nascentes originaliter transeunte et parentum primorum debito universos posteros obligante. Haec traditio prius in genesi significata est ubi cum ser-

⁹⁵ Lyonnet 1961, 1–31. The author overall evaluates significant differences between Greek Fathers and Augustine on Rm., 5, 12. Importantly, Lyonnet argues that Cyril's works uniquely reflect Augustinianism in Greek, though less explicit than Augustine regarding the causality of Adamite sin in vocabulary and force. I concur with his conclusions, but add below a possible Cyrillic citation of *Augustinus graecus* (Rm., 5, 12) apparently unknown to Lyonnet.

⁹⁶ See Meyendorff 1974b, 235–236, who correctly noticed the lack of guilt-laden language in Palamas.

⁹⁷ Beatrice 2013, 147. See Ambr., *Expos. Evang. sec.*, I 4, 67 Luc., ed. G. Tissot, Paris 1956, p. 178, 24–25, citing the *Vetus Latina* Rm 5, 12. Compare Aug., *Contra Jul.* 1, 3, 10, ed. J.P. Migne, Paris 1866, col. 646. Ambrose (citing Rm., 5, 12) interpreted Paul to mean: "[...] culpa mors omnium est." Augustine knew Ambrose's prior work. See also Ambrose referring again to Rm., 5, 12 in Ambr., *Apol. alt. Dav.*, II 12, 71, ed. C. Schenkl, Vienna 1898, p. 406, 25–27: "[...] omnes in primo homine peccavimus, per naturae successionem culpae quoque ab uno in omnes transfuse successio est [...]" What needs to be explained, however, is not Augustine's self-styled faithfulness to Ambrose, but rather his departure from guilt-laden language when speaking of infants (versus "the faithful").

⁹⁸ Beatrice 2013, 66. Contra Beatrice, Augustine assiduously avoided the term *culpa* with infants (unlike his successors). Beatrice's thoroughgoing study on the question might risk retrojecting the Latin patristic *reception* of Augustine into the passages under investigation. See Aug., *De pecc. merit.*, 2, 4, 4, ed. C. Urba and I. Zycha, Vienna 1913, p. 73, 15–20, 22–23, p. 74, 1: "Concupiscentia igitur tamquam lex peccati manens in membris corporis mortis huius, cum parvulis nascitur, in parvulis baptizatis a reatu solvit, ad agonem relinquitur, ante agonem mortuos nulla damnatione persequitur; parvulos non baptizatos reos innectit et tamquam irae filios, etiamsi parvuli moriantur, ad condemnationem trahit [...] deletis peccatis omnibus, solute etiam reatu, quo vincitos originaliter detinebat, ad agonem interim manet [...]" See also Aug., *De pecc. merit.*, 2, 28, 45–46, p. 116, 20–27, p. 117, 1–21, Urba/Zycha.

pentī dictum esset [...] (Δικαιοσύνη τινὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς ἔξουσίαν τοῦ διαβόλου τὸ ἀνθρώπινον παρεδόθη γένος τῆς τοῦ πρώτου ἀνθρώπου ἀμαρτίας εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐκ συναφείας ἐκατέρου τοῦ γένους γεννωμένους προγονικῶς διαβαινούσης καὶ τῆς τῶν προπατόρων ὄφειλῆς τοὺς μεταγενεστέρους ἀπαντας καθιστώσης ἐνόχους. Αὕτη δὴ παράδοσις πρότερον ἐν τῇ Γενέσει δεδήλωται, ἔνθα τοῦ ὅφεως ἀκούσαντος [...])⁹⁹

The post-Augustinian tendency to place Augustine's language under the umbrella of legally imputed *culpa* was not peculiar to Planudes (nor to the Schoolmen below).¹⁰⁰ Actually, Byzantium had long ago indirectly absorbed Augustine's doctrine through none other than Leo the Great's *Tome* at Chalcedon. Leo followed the theological line of Ambrose of Milan by interpreting – what Augustine sees more ambiguously as a quasi-moral fetal defect – full-fledged guilt as the human inheritance. Planudes' followed suit in this regard, but his Greek translation also went beyond Augustine *ad litteram* in another way: by interpreting Augustine's *propago/propages* (offspring) as “a root” (πόλις). Even so, Planudes' translation fit perfectly within the pale of Augustinian metaphor, as in *Contra Julianum*, where Augustine had argued that Adam was the *radix* or root of sin.¹⁰¹

Palamas used *Augustinus graecus* by extending Augustinian plant-shoot metaphor to describe Adam's propagation as devilish venom infecting human progeny. Palamas theologically adapted Augustine to the foregoing Greek tradition, such as Maximos Confessor, whose formulations were clearly bereft of imputing criminal liability to a fetus. Maximos supposed only weakness or propensity to sin in humanity *qua* nature because of a divine imprecation bringing about a curse or weakness in humankind. The will is discussed as the subject of human infirmity, and particularly guilt. Pala-

⁹⁹ Aug. *De Trin.*, II 13, 12, 16, p. 402, 1–5 Mountain (Gr. tr. p. 737).

¹⁰⁰ I thank Nathaniel McCallum for drawing my attention to the Augustinian distinction between *culpa* and *reatus*. For other classic passages (all lacking *culpa*), see Aug., *Contra Jul.* 6, 17, 51, cols. 852–853 Migne. See especially Aug. *De nupt. concept.*, 1, 25, 28, ed. C. Urba and I Zycha, Vienna 1902, p. 240, 11–14, 16–19: “[...] quomodo ista concupiscentia carnis maneat in regenerato [...] quandoquidem per ipsam seminatur et cum ipsa carnalis ignitur proles parentis [...] Ad haec respondeatur dimitti concupiscentiam carnis in baptismo non ut non sit, sed ut in peccatum non inputetur. Quamvis autem reatu suo iam soluto, manet tamen donec sanetur omnis infirmitas nostra proficient renovatione interioris hominis de die in diem [...]”

¹⁰¹ Aug., *Contra Jul.* 1, 9, 42, col. 670 Migne: “Nonne sensus hominis donum Dei est? Et tamen ibi locavit inimicus ille seminator radicem mali, quando peccatum homini serpentina fraude persuasit (Gn., 3, 1–16). Nisi radicem mali humanus tunc reciperet sensus, nullo modo male suadenti accommodaretur assensus. Quoniam si dixeris, ex libero arbitrio naturae bonae a Deo creatae ortam mali radicem (quod catholica veritas dicit); illis verbis tuis te facillime superat [...] quia et liberum arbitrium procul dubio est donum Dei.” Shortly after Palamas' death, another Augustinian work became partially available in a Greek translation, which referred to the will as the “root of evil.” Only the following is extant: Aug. and Proch., *De lib. arb.* 1, 1–90, ed. H. Hunger, Verlag 1990, pp. 13–53. If a complete Greek text is hypothesized to have once existed, the reference to the will as “root” will have been (hypothetically): Aug. [and Proch.], *De lib. arb.*, 3, 17, 28. Augustine's work discussed familiar themes of Ps., 50, the devil, and sin. For a description of the manuscript, see Mercati 1931c, 29.

mas' innovation subsumed genetic, even biological, language to explain the propagation Adam's "ancient seed" as the very root infecting humanity with its serpentine poison. This grim anthropology was hardly traditional in Byzantium. Palamas cautiously (if unwittingly) adopted Augustine's legalistic language and his North African and (perhaps) Manichean associations surrounding human reproduction with infectious sin. Van Oort argues that residual Manicheism partially explains Augustine's conclusion that the punishment of damnation comes to fetuses born of parental "caro peccati" in the act of coitus.¹⁰² Following Palamas' Augustinian metaphors, as we shall see below, Palamites felt emboldened to accommodate the Augustinian theory of original sin to their own anthropologies. Admittedly, as we shall see, some Palamites travelled farther down the Augustinian road than Palamas with respect to "ancestral/original guilt."

Despite an attraction to biological metaphors for the transmission of original sin, Palamas struck a balance between Augustinian pessimism and a more optimistic Byzantine anthropology. In his *Homily 14: On the Annunciation*, Palamas had recourse to the humanity of the *Theotokos* to rescue anthropological optimism:

The Virgin is also duly called "Lady" in another sense, as she has mastery of all things, having divinely conceived and borne in virginity the Master of all by his nature. Yet she is the Lady not just because she is free from servitude and a partaker of divine power but because she is the fount and root ($\pi\gamma\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\ i\ \rho(\zeta)\alpha$) of the freedom of the human race, especially after the ineffable and joyful Birth. A married woman is ruled over rather than being a lady, especially after sorrowful and painful childbirth, in accordance with that curse on Eve: "in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." Freeing the human race, the Virgin Mother ($\dot{\eta}\ \pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu\mu\eta\tau\omega\rho$) received through the angel joy and blessing instead of this curse ($\dot{\alpha}\rho\alpha\zeta$).¹⁰³

In Augustine (*De Trin.*, 13, 16, 21), racial debt and freedom of the human race were contrasted as inheritances of the Devil and Christ, respectively. Diversely, Palamas marked the new headship or inheritance to derive from *Mary* as root. The metaphorical contrast clearly implicated Mary as devoid of the curse or the imprecation infecting Adam. This peculiarly Byzantine (and, thus, non-Augustinian) approach – partially indebted to a patristic tradition of (pre-)purification of Mary – sufficiently situated Palamas to defend Mary's unconditionally immaculate status, which simply culminated in the Palamite school with Scholarios, as we shall see below.¹⁰⁴

Palamas was very concentrated on Mary's role as clean root –opposed to the infectious root of Adam. This brought him to an ingenious and original contribution

¹⁰² Van Oort 1989, 382–386. The author argues that Manichees, as Augustine, saw sin transmitted by coitus or *consupiscentiae motu*. Van Oort suggested this to be underlying Origen (via the translation of Rufinus) as well. Augustinian sexual *motus inordinatus* of humun body is argued as equivalent to Manichean ὅτακτος κίνησις.

¹⁰³ *Homiliae*, IX 14, 8, p. 384, 14–23 (Engl. tr. p. 103).

¹⁰⁴ Candal 1962, 241–276, Kappes 2014, 18–68, 70–82.

to Mariology whereby Palamas opposed palaeo- and neo-Adamite roots. As Jugie first noted, Palamas' *Homily 57: Concerning the Genealogy* uniquely developed an exegesis, whereby the superior holiness of Mary's lineage, especially John the Baptist, Joachim, and Anna, foreshadowed the end term of a gradual and supernatural process of an ever more intense purifying of the bad seed from the root of Adam into a pure seed at the Virgin's conception in Anna's womb:¹⁰⁵

[Scholion on Lk., 1, 35:] The Spirit also arranged beforehand for the Virgin to come into being, choosing from the beginning, and cleansing, the line of her descent, accepting those who were worthy, or were to become fathers of eminent men, but utterly casting out the unworthy. (προφορκούμει δὲ καὶ τὴν ταῦτης εἰς τὸ εἶναι πρόδον ἄνωθεν ἐκλεγομένον καὶ ἀνακαθαῖρον τὴν τοῦ γένους σειράν, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀξίους ἡ ἀξιολόγων ἐσομένους πατέρας προσιέμενον, τοὺς δὲ ἀναξίους τελείως ἀποβαλλόμενον).¹⁰⁶

In the second stage of his narrative, Palamas related this “cleansing back” or “retro-cleansing” (ἀνακαθαῖρον) to the highly traditional doctrine of Jesus’ cleansing or purification at his baptism, which had been the point of departure of Gregorios Nazianzen and subsequent Greek tradition for equating the flesh of the prepurified Mary to the flesh of Jesus in every humanly perfective way:

Although the Virgin, of whom Christ was born according to the flesh, came from Adam's flesh and seed, yet, because this flesh had been cleansed in many different ways by the Holy Spirit from the start, she was descended from those who had been chosen from every generation for their excellence (εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἐκ σαρκός καὶ σπέρματος Αδὰμ ἡ Παρθένος, ἐξ ἣς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα Χριστός, ἀλλ’ ἐκ Πνεύματος ἀγίου κάκείνου πολυειδῶς ἄνωθεν καθαιρομένου, τῶν κατὰ γενεὰς ἀριστινδῆν ἐκλεγομένων [...]).¹⁰⁷

Nazianzen had declared that Christ's flesh (in addition to Mary's) had been cleansed. The inspiration for this kind of vocabulary derived from Jesus' and Mary's joint purification according to Luke's Gospel (Lk. 2:22), and Jesus' baptism in the Jordan.¹⁰⁸ Consequently, in the same homily, Palamas supposed that Joachim and Anna – as the penultimate generation of blood relatives before the conception of Mary in Anna's uterus – marked the terminus of all purification using a clever wordplay (ἀνακαθαῖρω,

¹⁰⁵ Jugie 1952, 228, Dvornik 1958, 109.

¹⁰⁶ *Homiliae*, XI 57, 6, p. 432, 20–24 (Engl. tr., p. 471).

¹⁰⁷ *Homiliae*, XI 57, 7, p. 434, 1–6 (Engl. tr., p. 471).

¹⁰⁸ Naz., *In Theoph.*, 38, 16, ed. J.-P. Migne, Paris 1858, cols. 329b, 1–5: “Μικρὸν μὲν οὖν ὕστερον ὅψει καὶ καθαιρόμενον Ἰησοῦν ἐν τῷ Ἱορδάνῃ τὴν ἐμὴν κάθαρσιν μᾶλλον δὲ ἀγνίζοντα τῇ καθάρσει τὰ ὕδατα (οὐ γὰρ δὴ αὐτὸς ἐδεῖτο καθάρσεως, ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου) [...] See also Naz., *De Test. et adv. Christ.*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Paris 1862, Carm. 9, col. 462A, 68–70: “Οὐδὲ ῥύσει βροτέην βροτὸς ἔπλετο, ἐκ δ' ἄρα σαρκός, Τὴν Πνεῦμαν ἤγνισε πρόσθεν ἀνυμφέα μητέρα κεδνήν, Αὐτοπαγῆς βροτὸς ἥλθε, καθήρατο δ' εἴνεκ' ἐμεῖο.”

καθαίρω, καθαιρόμενος).¹⁰⁹ Her parents were the holiest persons in the pre-lapsarian world until Mary herself.¹¹⁰ The *in utero* purification of John Baptist served to foreshadow the most perfect sort of cleansing possible for a human of Adam's lineage. Each generation of cleansing occurred in ever more miraculous ways until reaching its culmination in Mary.¹¹¹ In Damascenian fashion, Palamas supposed that Mary's conception occurred in a passionless and clean embrace of Joachim and Anna in his *Homily 53: On the Holy of Holies*:

She was a gift from God [...] even before she was born – how could she be otherwise, as she was pre-ordained before all ages as the dwelling-place of the maker of all worlds? She was a gift to God and the fruit of her righteous parents' vow and supplication [...] O finest of couples! O elect pair who cultivated and presented to God a dwelling-place dearer than heaven! She was brought, like a most holy shoot (βλαστός) sprung (έβλαστησεν) from a holy root, a shoot reaching from earthly to heaven [...] a shoot which would soon bring forth the pre-eternal, unfading flower, and was to produce him by whose word alone everything natural and supernatural sprang to life.¹¹²

Above, Palamas came full circle so that ancient seed and new seed are perfectly contrasted with a symmetrical first man and first woman for each order (infection or purity). I note, as well, Mary's epithet of "shoot" that has "sprung" from a root intricately meshes with Palamas' established vocabulary of original sin. Palamas continues to offer his Augustinian inspired metaphors but at this point with respect to Mary. Whereas the first parents had initiated a deleterious lineage, Mary and Christ initiated its opposite. Importantly, Palamas appealed to Mary's predestination or God's foreknowing

109 This satisfies Spiteris 1996, 575, where the author proposes Palamas as theoretically rejecting an immaculate conception due to Mary's conception by human seed, versus virginally. Spiteris takes Palamas' statement to be *restrictive* and not *descriptive* of an effect of the hypostatic union. Categorically asserting a chasm between virginally conceived human nature and naturally conceived nature, Spiteris repeats the common error of understanding the "purification" of Mary at the Annunciation along the lines of a non-theological and non-Greek lexical sense of the word, as did later Latin Schoolmen. This sense supposes Marian purification to be either from sin, or from concupiscence. Lastly, Spiteris assumes that Palamas and Augustine did not share the same doctrine of original sin. My study challenges this gratuituous assertion. Because traducianism and infected flesh are not Spiteris' focus for "Augustine's" theory of original sin, I take him to refer to spermatic transmission thereof and to infection of the flesh. See Spiteris 1998, 163–165, 167. Spiteris fails to address the logic of Mary's purification at Jesus' resurrection in Spiteris 1998, 159–163. At the Annunciation, if purification lexically and contextually involves imperfection, then Mary's imperfections ostensibly require morally purifying light when witnessing the resurrection.

110 *Homiliae*, XI 52, 11, p. 251, 26–30 (Engl. tr., p. 411).

111 See Meyendorff 1974b, 236–236. Although Meyendorff clearly misunderstood the long and consistent tradition of the *Theotokos* as prepurified, he was prudently cautious in assuming that Palamas' use thereof served as proof of taint in the Virgin. Meyendorff posed instead a series of questions rather than committing to categorical denial of the Immaculate Conception in Palamas. My study answers his queries, save his question of the rationale for Mary's death – granted the fact of the Immaculate Conception.

112 *Homiliae*, XI 53, 23, p. 289, 12–15, 24–29 (Engl. tr., p. 424).

and preordaining her grace and glory, which was a development of Maximos' theology of the absolute primacy of Christ.¹¹³ Ultimately, we shall see that this Maximian mode of doing Christology allowed Scholarios to graft Franciscanism (or the absolute primacy of Christ) onto Byzantine theology without the slightest need to adjust the Orthodox thesis on the all-holiness of Mary.¹¹⁴

One last point is helpful to contextualize Scholarios' approach to arguing Mary's privilege, namely, "prepurification." "Purification" of Jesus or Mary consistently signaled in Nazianzen-dependent patristic literature a phenomenon whereby an already pure and all-holy nature is intensified in its participation in grace and glory during the course of the history of salvation.¹¹⁵ The Greek Fathers added the prefix "pre-" (*προ-*) to the purification of the *Theotokos* to designate the moment of grace temporally prior to the incarnation. Palamas implied that other liturgically celebrated mysteries of Mary's life were also of such a kind of purification (e. g., her vision of light at the resurrection).

Palamas knew intimately the tradition of the (*προ-*)*καθαρθεῖσα* through Nazianzen, Sophronius, and others.¹¹⁶ Palamas affirmed the parallelism between wholly perfect (human) natures of Jesus and Mary. Palamas also designated Mary as spotless (*ἀμόλυντος*) in imitation of the "prokatharsis" formula in Sophronius of Jerusalem.¹¹⁷ Significantly, in Palamas' *Homily on the Meeting of the Lord*, he contrasted Mary's birth to humanly iniquitous birth alluded to in LXX Ps., 50. For his part, Christ was exempt from "purification" in the ordinary sense, for he was never morally or physically impure.¹¹⁸ Palamas connected the seedless incarnation with Jesus' exemption from the Mosaic Law. The incarnate Word was not subject to Mosaic Law (and therefore to conception in iniquity) and Mary participated in this perfection of human nature under the aegis of Christ, which stemmed from her role as divine Mother (*Θεομήτωρ*). Consequently, as already hinted above by Palamas, Mary was exempt from the sin and iniquity in conception and birth, as in LXX Ps., 50. Evidence for this exemption includes Mary's exemption from Eve's travails in labor. Christ as perfect mediator had supplied her with perfect flesh so as to exempt both of them from the law of iniquity and sin.¹¹⁹

¹¹³ Scotistic and Maximian primacies overlap, see Florovsky 1976, 168–170, and Bucur 2008, 199–215.

¹¹⁴ Palamas considered the *Theotokos* the reason-cause (*αίτια*) of all created items pre- and post-Mary in *Homiliae*, IX 14, 15, p. 394, 15.

¹¹⁵ Candal 1962, 253, Manoussakis 2015, 8–14, Nichols 2015, 160–164.

¹¹⁶ *Homiliae*, IX 16, 15, p. 442, 17: "ὁ Χριστὸς πρὸς βάπτισμα [...] δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαίρεται."

¹¹⁷ Sophr., *Oratio 2: In Sanct. Deipar. Annunt.*, 24, and 43, ed. J.-P. Migne, Paris 1865, col. 3248A, 1–6, 3273D, 45–47: "Οὐδεὶς κατά σε μεμακάρισται, οὐδεὶς κατά σε καθαγίασται· οὐδεὶς κατά σε μεμεγάλυνται, οὐδεὶς κατά σε προκεκάθαρται· οὐδεὶς κατά σε περιτύγασται, οὐδεὶς κατά σε ἐκπεφώτισται [...] Πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐπὶ σὲ, τὴν ἀμόλυντον, κάτεισι, καθαρωτέραν σε ποιησόμενον, καὶ καρπογόνον σοι παρεξόμενον δύναμιν." These passages are investigated in Kappes 2014, 30–37, 73.

¹¹⁸ *Homiliae*, IX 5, 6, p. 148, 5–17.

¹¹⁹ Mary's universal mediatorship or role as mediatrix in Palamas was firmly established in Jugie 1952, 236–237.

In a final passage, employing the Greco-patristic notion of Mary's elevation in grace or purification, Palamas writes about Mary as the first witness of the resurrection:

The Mother of God possessed a great joy, she understood the matters from the angel and became full of light, as she was both utterly purified (*κεκαθαρμένην*) and divinely filled with grace (*κεχαριτωμένην*), and she too was one who knew absolutely certainly the truth and she believed the angel.¹²⁰

Above, Palamas uses an alternatively biblical and patristic term in place of the traditional *προ καθαρθεῖσα*. Palamas naturally chose the form of “to purify” lacking a prefix (pro-) because of the post-incarnational chronology of the resurrection event. He clarified the prepurification as another installment of the same profoundly miraculous grace has been given at Gabriel’s greeting by citing Lk. 1, 28 (*κεχαριτωμένην*). Priorly, Greek Fathers consistently used “purify” and “prepurify” interchangeably for the incarnation experience of Mary in the whole of the patristic literature. Subsequent to Palamas, Palamites (as opposed to Palamas himself) often used the prefix “pre-/προ-.” Still, Palamites correctly employed *προκαθαρθεῖσα* in regard to the miraculous happenings concerning Mary prior to the incarnation that coincide with Byzantine liturgical feasts in the calendar. Any purification prefixed with “pre-/προ-” was nothing less than a moment of elevation in grace and miraculous glory *prior to* the event of the Incarnation. For his part, Palamas employed an alternative lexical term (purify/*καθαίρω*) when speaking of the toddler Mary in the Temple. There, she had been purified long before her second purification at the incarnation.¹²¹ Palamas described Mary as someone in possession of a perfectly divinized body and soul, whose human nature excelled angelic purity. Palamas combined his “kathartic” Mariology with a traditional scholion on Lk. 1, 35:

So what did the Virgin “filled with grace” and divine and incomparable in wisdom, reply to these words? Again, she runs toward God and holds her hands up in prayer toward him, while she says to the archangel: “If the Holy Spirit” – according to the things you say – “will come upon me, then it further cleanses (*καθαῖρον*) my nature and fortifies me to receive the saving fetus; if a power of the Most High overshadows me, then I form within myself what is after the nature of man, who is in the form of God and I create a seedless childbirth.” [...] For [Isaiah] did not immediately see the Seraphim, who took the tongs from the spiritual altar of heaven; for by means of the tongs, the Seraphim took the item in the tongs’ grasp, through which the Angel too touched his [Isaiah’s] lips, after he gave to him a cleansing (*κάθαρσιν*). But this is that famous item in the tongs’ grasp via that well-known great vision; namely, Moses saw a Bush lit and yet not consumed from fire.¹²²

¹²⁰ *Homiliae*, IX 18, 10, p. 530, 18–21 (Translation mine).

¹²¹ *Homiliae*, XI 52, 13, p. 252, 26–28, p. 254, 1–11.

¹²² *Homiliae*, IX 14, 14, p. 392, 15–27; p. 394, 1–6 (Translation mine).

Palamas utilized the familiar participle (καθαῖρον), repeatedly employed by the Damascene.¹²³ Palamas might have also taken his image of Mary as “burning bush” from Damascene as well.¹²⁴ In conclusion, Palamas saw Mary’s purification as a supernatural addition of divinizing grace into an otherwise angelic nature. He also connected Mary’s purification to feasts of the Byzantine liturgical calendar. From Palamas the Palamites surmised that Mary’s conception in the womb of St. Anna, Mary’s presentation in the Temple, and the incarnation served as moments of extraordinary grace (prepurification) in anticipation of the saving offspring Mary existed to provide blameless flesh to Jesus. We will see that Scholarios was likely encouraged to imitate Palamas’ overall approach to Mary’s conception through recourse to seed-root analogies, citations from Augustine, and the use of lexical variants surrounding the theology of prepurification.

5 A Palamite-friendly Theologian, the Palamite School, and Original Sin

5.1 Nicholas Kabasilas, Original Sin, and Immaculate Conception

Before discussing my claims about Kabasilas using Augustine in his theological explanation of baptism, it is important to note here that Congourdeau has recently compiled scholarly evidence that suggests Kabasilas’ usage of Augustine.¹²⁵ Earlier in my study, we saw Kabasilas calling baptism a cure for the Adamite “seed of evil,” which had brought about the inheritance passed down to the present-day from humanity’s forefathers.¹²⁶ In yet another work, Kabasilas paired Augustinian metaphors (via Pala-

¹²³ Damasc., *Expos. fid.*, II 46, ed. B. Kotter, Berlin 1973, p. 109, 16–19: “Μετὰ οὖν τὴν συγκατάθεσιν τῆς ἀγίας παρθένου πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐπῆλθεν ἐπ’ αὐτὴν κατὰ τὸν τοῦ κυρίου λόγον, ὃν εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος, καθαῖρον αὐτὴν καὶ δύναμιν δεκτικὴν τῆς τοῦ λόγου θεότητος παρέχον, ἅμα δὲ καὶ γεννητικὴν [...]” For the same term and Marian theme, see also Damasc., *Contra Nest.*, IV 43, ed. B. Kotter, Berlin 1981, pp. 286–287, 39–45. Again, see Damasc., *In nativ. Dom.*, V 2, ed. B. Kotter, New York 1988, p. 326, 14–19.

¹²⁴ Damasc., *Orat. de imag.* III 22, p. 129, 3–5: “[...] Ἡ βάτος καὶ ἡ ἐπὶ πόκον ὑετὸς τὴν παρθένον καὶ θεοτόκον [...]”

¹²⁵ Kabasilas appears to cite Augustine in books 6–7 of his *De vita in Christo* per Congourdeau 2004, 201–202. Kabasilas also appeared to cite Anselm of Canterbury. See J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010e, 70–71.

¹²⁶ I note, too, that Kabasilas held an Augustinian approach to infected bodies passing on their evil to other bodies (in copulation). See Cabas., *De vit. in Christ.*, I 2, 39, p. 168, 1–8 Congourdeau: ‘Ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐ παραπολαύει μόνον τὸ σῶμα τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς παθῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μεταδίδωσι τῶν αὐτοῦ· καὶ χαίρει γάρ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ ἄχθεται, καὶ σωφρονικοί τινές εἰσι καὶ ἐλεύθεροι τῷ διακεῖσθαι ὡδὶ τὸ σῶμα διὰ τοῦτο ἀκόλουθον ἦν καὶ τὴν ἐκάστου ψυχὴν τῆς τοῦ πρώτου Αδάμ κληρονομῆσαι κακίας, ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκείνου πρὸς τὸ σῶμα δοθείσης, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ σώματος τοῖς ἐξ ἐκείνου σώμασιν, ἀπὸ δ’ αὖ τῶν σωμάτων ἐπὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἔρχομένης.

mas?) with discussions of the prepurification of Mary. Kabasilas' *Sermo in Nativitatem Deiparae* repeated similar Augustinian notions:

Because of these arguments, God never allowed any human to rejoice – prior to the Virgin – as still under liability [to punishment], all partaking of the ancient, unfortunate inheritance (διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ οὐδὲ ἀλλω τινὶ τῶν ἐξ αἰῶνος ἀνθρώπων ὁ Θεός, πρὸ τῆς παρθένου, χαίρειν ἐφῆκεν, ὡς ἂν εἰς ὑπευθύνους ἔτι τελούντων, καὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ κλήρου πάντων μετειληφότων τοῦ δυστυχοῦ).¹²⁷

Earlier in the very same sermon, Kabasilas had already called this inheritance “the common sickness” ([...] τὴν κοινὴν [...] νόσον [...]) of humans.¹²⁸ This ostensibly echoed Augustine (*De Trin.* 4, 4, 7), who spoke exactly thus about baptism curing the infirmity (*infirmitas/nόσος*) brought about by Satan.¹²⁹

Do we need to account for Kabasilas' doctrine of baptism and original sin by recourse to Aquinas as well? After all, Kabasilas was a friend and intimate of Demetrios Kydones, who had successfully translated Aquinas' *SG* into Greek on Christmas Eve of 1354.¹³⁰ Although Kabasilas could have hypothetically employed Aquinas for original sin, I have not found Aquinas' vocabulary or phraseology reflected in Kabasilas on this question. Nevertheless, Demetracopoulos has convincingly argued that Kabasilas employed the *ST* at least once in his *De vita in Christo*.¹³¹ Consequently, it is simply a matter of fact that Kabasilas knew at least some selection from the *ST*. Prior to this, Jugie had discovered that Demetrios had access to Aquinas' *Tertia Pars* (*ST*, 3, 27–28), where he discovered arguments against the Immaculate Conception. Surprisingly, pro-Thomistic Kydones completely disagreed with Aquinas' rejection of the Immaculate Conception. Though Kydones translated parts of Aquinas' material into Greek, he reworked the original sources and arguments (especially on [pre]-purification) to arrive at polar opposite conclusions.¹³² As Jugie noted, Kydones exploited Aquinas' use of a Ps.-Dionysian analogy, whereby “purification” meant the sharing of fiery and resplendent knowledge passed noetically between angels. This knowledge simply made them more exalted beings. Aquinas adopted this common Scholastic axiom, although he did not manage to utilize it perfectly in respect to Mary so as to drive out any concept of putative *fomes* of concupiscence at the Annunciation. Aquinas failed to reconcile the Ps.-Dionysian tradition with a terribly misunderstood Latin translation of Damascene's Greek *Expositio fidei* (46, p. 109, 16–19), where it is written of Mary at the Annunciation: “[...] igitur semper Virginis, Spiritus Sanctus supervenit super ipsam

¹²⁷ Kab., *Sermo in Nat.*, 10, ed. M. Jugie, Turnhout 1990, p. 476, 21–24 (Translation mine).

¹²⁸ Kab., *Sermo in Nat.*, 6, p. 472, 26 Jugie.

¹²⁹ Aug. and Planud., *Περὶ Τριάδος*, 4, 4, 7, p. 279, 26–35 Παπαθωμόπουλος/Τσαβαρή/Rigotti.

¹³⁰ Congourdeau 2009, 173–176, Plested 2012c, 103–104.

¹³¹ J. A. Demetracopoulos 1998, 77–83. For Demetracopoulos' critique of Spiteris who denies Anselmian influence, see J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010e, 76–80.

¹³² Jugie 1952, 275–281.

secundum Domini sermonem, quam dixit angelus, purgans ipsam et virtutem susceptivam deitatis Verbi tribuens, simul autem et generativam.”¹³³ Aquinas, like the entire throng of Schoolmen, uncritically adopted the opinion that Mary’s “purification” must refer to some sort of cleansing from sin:¹³⁴

Argument 3: Besides, the Damascene says that “The Holy Spirit, while It was purifying her, came upon” the Blessed Virgin before the time of the conception of the Son of God. But this cannot be understood as other than a purification from concupiscence, as Augustine says in his work *De natura et gratia*, for she did not commit sin. Therefore, she was not profusely cleansed from concupiscence through sanctification in utero (*Praeterea, Damascenus dicit quod in beata virgine supervenit spiritus sanctus purgans eam, ante conceptionem filii Dei. Quod non potest intelligi nisi de purgatione a fomite, nam peccatum non fecit, ut Augustinus dicit, in libro de natura et gratia. Ergo per sanctificationem in utero non fuit libere mundata a fomite [...] (ST, 3, 27, 3, arg. 3)*)

Response to Argument 3: It must be said that the Holy Spirit produced a double purification on the matter of the Blessed Virgin: [a.] Indeed, it worked one purification, as if it were preparatory for the conception of Christ, whose conception was not out of any sort of impurity of guilt or concupiscence; but the Spirit was recollecting her mind into a greater concentration and withdrawing her from what is common. For, too, the angels are called “purified,” in whom no impurity is found, as Dionysius says in chapter six of *De ecclesiasticis hierarchiis*. [b.] However, the Holy Spirit worked another purification in her through of the conception of Christ, which was of the Holy Spirit. Also, according to this, it may be said that it purified her entirely from the kindling [of sin] (*Ad tertium dicendum quod spiritus sanctus in beata virgine duplē purgationem fecit. Unam quidem quasi praeparatoriā ad Christi conceptionem, quae non fuit ab aliqua impuritate culpae vel fomitis, sed mentem eius magis in unum colligens et a multitudine sustollens. Nam et Angeli purgari dicuntur, in quibus nulla impuritas invenitur, ut Dionysius dicit, VI cap. Eccles. Hier. Aliam vero purgationem operatus est in ea spiritus sanctus mediante conceptione Christi, quae fuit opus spiritus sancti. Et secundum hoc potest dici quod purgavit eam totaliter a fomite.*). (ST, 3, 27, 3, ad 3)¹³⁵

Jugie already located and edited Aquinas *graecus*’ relevant excerpts, which Demetrios reemployed from *ST* (whether Aquinas *latinus* or *graecus*) in order to argue exactly opposite:¹³⁶

Wherefore, [The Spirit] came upon her, enlightening the mind with knowledge of divine things and truth [...] It both was purifying the body and not merely hallowing unto purification out of excellence [...] but some other peculiarly marvelous [purification] (Ἐπῆλθε δ' οὖν λαμπρῦνον μὲν αὐτῇ τὸν νοῦν τῇ τῶν θείων ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ αληθείᾳ [...] καθαῖρον δέ καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἀγιάζον οὐ τὴν ἐξ ἀρετῆς κάθαρσιν μόνον [...] ἄλλην δέ τινα ιδίαν καὶ θαυμαστήν [...] [...])¹³⁷

¹³³ Damasc., *De fid. Orth.*, 3, 2 [46], ed. E. Buytaert, St. Bonaventure 1955, p. 171, 4–7.

¹³⁴ Chittini 1957, 3–23.

¹³⁵ The translation is mine.

¹³⁶ This is hardly an isolated incident. For instance, no longer extant translations must parsimoniously be supposed in writings of Markos of Ephesus, per J. A. Demetracopoulos 2011b, 361–362, 369.

¹³⁷ Jugie 1952, 281. Compare cod. *Par. gr.*, 1213, folio 340r (Translation mine).

As already explained, the entire patristic and late Byzantine tradition of Mary's purification was one where it was interpreted as testimony to her complete holiness without any taint of physical or moral imperfection. Demetrios was equally aware of the Byzantine notion and proffered his arguments accordingly.

Now that we examined the seminal text introducing Aquinas' Mariology into Byzantium, we are prepared to return to Kabasilas' *Sermo in Nativitatem Deiparae*. In addition to reading Augustine, Kabasilas must have been aware of the Dominican position on the Immaculate Conception. There are two possible explanations for such familiarity with the debate. First, Kabasilas explicitly attested the fact that he knew of Latin missionaries orally debating religious matters, either in Constantinople, or in Thessalonica.¹³⁸ The theological matter of concern thereat, however, was the epiclesis, which had been a peculiar preoccupation of Dominicans, since 1341, in their mission territories of Armenia.¹³⁹ Two papal solutions for the debate strongly endorsed Aquinas.¹⁴⁰ Sometime after 1317, Nikephoros Kallistou Xanthopoulos (d. c. 1335) testified concerning a new Byzantine debate about the Immaculate Conception.¹⁴¹ Given the fact that the Greek terms and the context (that is, purification at the Annunciation) exactly fit the Dominican polemic within the *ST* against immaculatists, Jugie rightly supposed that Dominicans introduced this Latin debate into Byzantium. Whatever Kabasilas' experience in Byzantium with Dominicans, his Marian sermon confronted this debate and leaves us little doubt that Kabasilas knew of his friend Demetrios' aforementioned sermon reorganizing *ST* 3, 27. In a similar vein, Kabasilas addressed and reformulated Aquinas' own arguments in order to reject Dominican conclusions on the Immaculate Conception:¹⁴²

If there are some of the holy doctors who say that the Virgin is pre-purified by the Spirit, then it is yet necessary to think that purification, that is, an addition of graces, is intended by these authors, and these [doctors] say that this is the way the angels are "purified," with respect to whom there is nothing knavish (Εἰ δὲ προκεκαθάρθαι τῷ Πνεύματι τὴν παρθένον εἰσὶν οἵ φασι τῶν ἱερῶν διδασκάλων, ἀλλὰ τὴν κάθαρσιν προσθήκην χαρίτων αὐτοῖς βούλεοθαι χρὴ νομίζειν, οἵ καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον φασι καθαίρεσθαι, παρ' οἷς οὐδὲν πονηρόν).¹⁴³

Because of Kabasilas' appeal to the traditional vocabulary of purification (*προκαθαίρω*), he clearly had in mind Greek Fathers. They indeed affirmed a definition of

¹³⁸ Kab., *Explic.*, 29, 1, ed. S. Salaville, Paris 1967, pp. 180, 182.

¹³⁹ Ben. XII, *Cum Dudum*, III 8, ed. A.L. Täutu, Vatican 1958, pp. 121–143.

¹⁴⁰ Clement VI (1342–1352) subsequently called for the Armenian Christians to remove or amend their epicleses after Dominican requests. See McKenna 2009, 74–75.

¹⁴¹ Jugie 1952, 217–218.

¹⁴² This discovery fully justifies an analysis of yet another work of Kabasilas in J. A. Demetracopoulos 1999, 25–29. Therein, the author reveals Scholastic style and vocabulary utilized in confronting philosophical questions. The *SG* is shown to be the obvious circumstantial and literary candidate for Kabasilas' inspiration.

¹⁴³ Kab., *Sermo in Nat.*, 10, p. 477, 1–5 Jugie (Translation mine).

prepurification contra Aquinas. However, among all Greek writers on the prepurified virgin –from Nazianzen until Palamas– nobody had ever argued in Greek that the sense of (pre-) purification (in regard to Mary) was parallel to Ps.-Dionysius' explanation of angels purifying one another. Firstly, this never occurred because Byzantine writers only understood prepurification in wholly positive terms. Secondly, in Greek, it was first Aquinas who employed this Ps.-Dionysian argument, as discovered by Kydones and Kabasilas. Parsimony, circumstance, and vocabulary all lead to the conclusion that each of the two inherited his argument from Latin Scholastic tradition (*ST*, 3, 27, 3, ad 3).¹⁴⁴ To all appearances, Kabasilas admired Kydones' reworking of Aquinas. Still, Kabasilas almost certainly knew maculism from the Dominicans themselves, as well as from Kydones. This inspired Kabasilas to become the first Greek Orthodox writer ever to feel the need to defend Mary's description of "prepurified." After all, native Greek speakers had never made it a *quaestio disputata* in Byzantium. Jugie even located for us a direct citation of Kabasilas' *Sermo in Nativitatem Deiparae* within Scholarios' immaculatist homily *Homélie sur la Dormition de la Sainte Vierge*.¹⁴⁵ Once again, we discover a strongly Orthodox and Palamite-friendly background that served to inspire Scholarios to make use of Augustine, while defending Mary as the immaculate "principle" or "root" of the new race in Christ.

5.2 Makarios Makres (d. c. 1431), Scholarios, and Original Sin

As we continue to move toward Scholarios' Mariological synthesis, it is important to keep in mind that Scholarios was a pupil of celebrated Palamites, from whom he would have learned to mix Augustinianism with Thomism regarding original sin. First, we will investigate Makres, though Scholarios' discipleship was cut short by his master's death. Makres ranks as the first known Palamite to adopt the notion of fetal "guilt" (whether from Planudes' translation of the *De Trinitate*, or from Ps.-Augustinian, *De fide ad Petram*):

Now, the acquisition has not come about according to what is customary to nature, but from virginal blood: not because the Lord disgusted the nature of a man and deemed the feminine nature

¹⁴⁴ Kabasilas, or Kydones, seemingly had access to François Meyronnes (d. 1328), who was the first Schoolman, whom I found, to turn Aquinas' ST 3, 27, 3, ad 3 argument on its head. Scholarios' access to Meyronnes's *opera*, as discussed below, increases this likelihood of Meyronnes as original source of Kabasilas' unique exploitation of Aquinas. Compare *Conflatus*, 3, 3, 2, 6: "Notwithstanding, [Mary] was truly purified (*purgata*), because Lk., 2 says that 'after the days of her purification were fulfilled.' [...]" See Dionysius, chapters six to eight, on *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, where it is said that the superior angels purify their inferiors, who have nevertheless no stain, from which they need be purified. Therefore, notwithstanding [Lk., 2, 22], the Blessed Virgin Mary did not contract original sin, though she was truly purified.

¹⁴⁵ Jugie 1914, 529.

as worthy for himself, but because he did not want his own divine conception to be preceded by the passion-involving and servile and nightly pleasure [coitus], on account of which David says [LXX Ps., 50, 5]: "in lawlessnesses was I conceived and my mother conceived me in sins." For, it was necessary that he who set up to enter the [human] life with the intention to eliminate the original sin and put away the life engaged in sensual things and passions, has a birth clean of the guilt and the impulse that has its origins from the aforementioned [conception] (Γίνεται δ' ἡ πρόσληψις οὐ κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός τῇ φύσει, ἀλλ' ἐξ αἰμάτων παρθενικῶν· οὐ τὴν μὲν ἀνδρὸς φύσιν τοῦ Κυρίου βδελυττομένου τὴν δὲ γυναικείαν ἀξίαν ἔστι τοῦ κρίνοντος, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐμπαθῆ καὶ δούλην καὶ νυκτερινήν ἡδονήν οὐκ ἀξιοῦντος τῆς αὐτοῦ θείας συλλήψεως καθηγήσασθαι, δι' ἣν "ἐν ἀνομίᾳς," φρούριον Δαβίδ, "συνελήφθην, καὶ ἐν ἀμαρτίαις ἐκίστησθε με ἡ μήτηρ μου." "Εδει γάρ τὸν ἐπ' ἀναιρέσει τῆς προγονικῆς ἀμαρτίας καὶ τῆς ἐν αἰσθήσει καὶ πάθεις ζωῆς ἀθετήσει τὸν βίον εἰσελθεῖν ἀξιώσαντα καθαρὸν τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ἐνοχῆς καὶ προτροπῆς ἔχειν τὸν τόκον).¹⁴⁶

Argyriou already discovered that Makres lifted a significant portion of his material above from SG, 3, 136.¹⁴⁷ Makres used the SG for apologetic treatises against Islam. The emergent picture – despite common Palamite rejection of Aquinas' *ad intra* metaphysics of God – proffers Aquinas' SG as an important Palamite source for doing theology. Even so, it is somewhat surprising that Makres adopted the notion of "guilt" for original sin as something imputable to children *in utero*. Makres enjoys the dubious honor of being the first Palamite to adopt this notion of ancestral or original guilt (irrespective of the term's historically and contextually *Augustinian* definition) into Orthodoxy.

5.3 Joseph Bryennios (d. c. 1431), Scholarios, and Immaculate Conception

Argyriou likewise discovered citations of SG, 4, 53 in Bryennios' works. There are some signs that Bryennios adopted peculiarly Augustinian and Thomistic modes of expressing belief in original sin. Generally, I have found precious few places in his works that suggest more than vague notions of death and destruction of the body that were fairly common fare outside of the almost singular exception of Maximos Confessor.

More significant for Scholarios, who was also a short-lived disciple of Bryennios, is the fact that Bryennios applied the patristic and Palamite wholly positive notion of Marian prepurification prior to the moment of her conception:

Another woman was not chosen over her, because God, foreknowing all women, sanctified in her mother's womb the one who was to be worthiest of all who were to exist, established her beyond all virtues; but he rejected all the women unworthy of this purpose, as was reasonable. And she

¹⁴⁶ Makr., *Défen. de la Virg.*, 2, 5, ed. A. Argyriou, Vatican 1986, p. 311, 7–14. Significantly, Scholarios extracted the very same material from Aquinas *graecus* as contained in Aquin. and Schol., *Flor. Thom.*, I 5, ed. J.A. Demetracopoulos, Leuven 2002, pp. 128, 1–35, 129, 1–2 (Translation mine).

¹⁴⁷ Argyriou 1986, 86–94.

possessed a virtue superior to all other virtues, that of being prepurified by the Holy Spirit and being prepared as a containing receptacle of the inaccessible divinity (Ἄλλη μὲν ταύτης οὐ προτείμηται, ὅτι πάσας ὁ Θεὸς προγινώσκων, τὴν τῶν λοιπῶν ἐσομένην ἀξιωτέραν ἐκ μήτρας ἡγίασε στείρας· ἀπεβάλετο δὲ τὰς εἰς τοῦτ' ἀναξίας ὥσπερ εἰκός· ἀρετῶν δὲ πασῶν ὑπερτέραν ἐκέκτητο, τὸ προκαθαρθῆναι τῷ Πνεύματι, καὶ δοχεῖον ἐτοιμασθῆναι δεκτικὸν τῆς ἀπροσίτου θεότητος [...]]) [...]]¹⁴⁸ (*Hom. 2 on the Annunc.*)

Bryennios provided his pupil with a methodology for examining Mariology.¹⁴⁹ Bryennios made ample use of Augustine's *De Trinitate* as an authority, particularly in sermons about the Annunciation and in the context of Mary's production of a seedless conception¹⁵⁰ Unlike Palamas and Kabasilas, Bryennios avoided the topic of Adamite seed, though he followed Palamas in affirming the presence of the venomous infection in Adamite flesh at birth.¹⁵¹ I find Bryennios obliquely mentioning themes of ancestral sin and the Adamite line but remaining curiously aloof from other facets of Augustine's or Palamas' terminology. In short, Bryennios exempted Mary in her first historical moment of existence from taint by recourse to the mystery of prepurification. Additionally, we should keep in mind that Argyriou found Bryennios frequently citing from Aquinas (*SG*, 4, 53).¹⁵² Hence, Bryennios' moderated Augustinianism might be explained either by his exposure to Aquinas (regarding infected flesh), or by the Greek patristic tradition. Whether one, the other, or both be the case, Bryennios presented God as bequeathing to Mary a perfect human nature from conception in order to conceive later Christ-flesh at a subsequent "prepuration" after the Annunciation.

5.4 Symeon of Thessalonica (d. c. 1429) and Original Sin

Scholarios appealed to Symeon as a major authority, though he failed to cite the passage below within his own treatise the *Sort des âmes après la mort*. I have found Symeon writing but briefly about original sin:¹⁵³

¹⁴⁸ Bryen., II, pp. 128–129.

¹⁴⁹ He uses a similar argument in *Hom. on Mary's Birthday* in Bryen., III, pp. 40–41.

¹⁵⁰ For example, see his *Hom. 3 on the Annunc.*, in Bryen., II, p. 192.

¹⁵¹ Bryen., II, p. 38: "Behold, we also celebrate [...] the rise out of a fruitless root [...] i. e., the birth [...] of the Mother of God [...] from a womb once sterile...once built out of the side of Adam, but the fall from the side of Adam is today through birth, which is itself infected (Καὶ τοῦτο ἴδού ἐορτάζομεν [...] τὴν ἐξ ἀκάρπου ρίζης ἀνατολήν [...] τῆς τοῦ Ἀδάμ πλευρᾶς τὸ παράπτωμα διὰ τῆς γεννήσεως αὐτῆς ἰωμένης [...]")" (*Hom. on Mary's birth.*) See also Bryen., III, pp. 38, 45, where he mentioned infection's calamitous blow (πληγή), which is concomitant with birth. See Bryen., II, p. 313, wherein he admits that Adam's children inherited a curse.

¹⁵² Argyriou 1986, 87.

¹⁵³ OCGS, I 1, p. 506, 15–22.

[Gloss on Rm., 5, 12:] [...] All were liable to death, being responsible from their mother's womb through original sin, and each person was enslaved to Hell through death, even if he was the most just human being [...] οἱ πάντες τῷ θανάτῳ ἥσαν ὑπόδικοι, τῇ τε προγονικῇ ὁμορτίᾳ ὑπεύθυνοι ἐκ γαστρός, καὶ δεδουλωμένος πᾶς ἦν τῷ ἄδη διὰ θανάτου, εἰ καὶ ὁ δικαιότατος ἦν.).¹⁵⁴

Clearly, the thrust of Palamite theology as thus far surveyed was to adopt some notion of “liability from the womb,” which cannot be accounted for outside of the (real or attributed) works of Augustine (and Aquinas). If some scholars have today saddled Scholarios with the reputation of being an innovator in Byzantium because of his teaching of original sin in an Augustinian fashion, the truth points rather to major figures of the Palamite school as his intellectual forebearers. Scholarios merely developed their ideas on the Adamite inheritance and traducian metaphors.

5.5 Markos of Ephesus (d. 1445), Original Sin, and the Prepurified Virgin

Eugenikos betrays no interest in Palamas’ or Kabasilas’ overt fascination in original sin. Eugenikos only referred to such at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439) as a mere *obiter dictum*. Eugenikos mused on the theological possibility of somebody dying without baptism (in original sin) to be in Hell. Still, he did not doctrinally evaluate these propositions. Apparently, Markos did not see the Latins’ supposition about original sin as a contentious issue between Latins and Greeks at Ferrara-Florence.¹⁵⁵ Markos’ apparent disinterest is curious since – next to Scholarios – Eugenikos made the greatest number of appeals to Augustine on behalf of Orthodox theology at Ferrara-Florence¹⁵⁶ Markos affirmed Augustine’s ecumenical authority there, too, since he explicitly revered the “apostolic” Divine Liturgy of St. James.¹⁵⁷ Its commemorations explicitly invoked Augustine as one among “[...] our holy Fathers and Teachers [...] ([...] τῶν ἀγίων πατέρων ἡ]μῶν καὶ διδασκάλων [...]])” (JAS, 37, p. 205, 24). In harmony with his Byzantine and Orthodox predecessors, Markos likewise set the Maximian notion of Mary’s predestination to grace and glory in relation to her prepurification at the Annunciation, but also applied it to her ideal ideal pre-existence in the mind of God.¹⁵⁸

Scholarios knew Markos, firstly, as his childhood tutor and, secondly, as his spiritual father. Also, Scholarios unmistakably read and cited Eugenikos’ treatise contain-

¹⁵⁴ Sym., *Epist. ad fidel.*, I 2, ed. D. Balfour, Thessalonica 1981, pp. 128–129, 543–548.

¹⁵⁵ PO, XV, pp. 26, 55–56, 59.

¹⁵⁶ Demacopoulos and Papanikolaou 2008, 15–16.

¹⁵⁷ Eugen., *libellus*, 3, ed. L. Petit, Rome 1977, p. 120, 6–35.

¹⁵⁸ Eugen., *Λόγ. Ἀντιρρό. Α'*, ed. M. Pilavakis, Bucarest 2014, p. 212, 4–6: “[...] ὁ Θεὸς τὸ ἔαυτοῦ παντοδύναμον ἐπιδεῖξαι ἡθέλησε, πλὴν ὅτι καὶ αυτῇ διὰ Πνεύματος ἀγίου δαψιλεστέρα χάριτι προσρυέντος καὶ δυνάμεως θείας προκαθαρθείσῃ [...]”

ing a small exposition on Mary's prepurification.¹⁵⁹ We learn from the extant writings of Markos of Ephesus that original sin was simply not a major concern of his. Still, like his Byzantine and Orthodox predecessors, prepurification counted as a divine mystery betokening Mary's predestination to an unparalleled grace among the saints.

6 Scholarios' Latin Sources for Original Sin and Immaculate Conception

6.1 Scholarios, Augustine, and Original Sin

I now concern myself with Scholarios' Mariology as related to his concept of original sin and as taken *directly* from Augustine. Later, we will be forced to adjudicate between Scholarios' dependence on either Aquinas' mitigated Augustinianism, or on wholesale Augustinian traducianism and its alleged notion of fetal "guilt."¹⁶⁰ Meyendorff accused Augustine of having been theologically led astray about original sin by a distorted Latin text of Paul's letter to the Romans: "[...] in Adam all sinned ([...] *in quo omnes peccaverunt* [...]]) [...]" (Rm., 5, 12).¹⁶¹ Augustine's version of the *Vetus Latina* adopted a sense different than the NT in the Greek *textus receptus*, which reads:¹⁶²

Because of this, as sin entered into the world through one human and through sin, death, so also death passed unto all human beings, because all humans sinned (Διὰ τοῦτο ὥσπερ δὶς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν, ἐφ' ὃ πάντες ἡμαρτον.). (Rm., 5, 12)

¹⁵⁹ Because Scholarios wrote this treatise *Contre les partisans d'Acindyne* post-1445, it does not guarantee that Scholarios knew Eugenikos' teaching on "prepurified" Mary. Yet, circumstantially, both Eugenikos and Scholarios studied Palamism together in 1437; see Kappes 2014, 166. Obviously, this would have been the most propitious time for Scholarios to read Eugenikos' antirrhetics. Eug., *Ἄντιψ. Α'* was cited by Scholarios within his own first treatise on the essence-energies question. Scholarios cited from Eugenikos' patristic anthology, both verbatim and at length. In a first example, Scholarios introducing a quote of Basil the Great, wherein Scholarios even cited Eugenikos' original words to introduce the same. Compare: (1.) Eug., *Ἄντιψ. Α'*, p. 92, 18–19 Pilavakis, to OCGS, III 6, p. 215, 21–34, (2.) OCGS, III 6, p. 216, 8–24, to Eug., *Ἄντιψ. Α'*, p. 268, 17–24 Pilavakis.

¹⁶⁰ Congourdeau 2007, 269–270, traces out Augustine's *ex professo* traducianism, where Augustine chose among competing theories that which was best disposed toward transmission of original sin from parent to child.

¹⁶¹ Meyendorff 1983, 144.

¹⁶² Compare Aug. *Contra Jul.*, 4, 4, 7, ed. C. Urba and I Zycha, Vienna 1913, p. 528, 10–15, to *Cod. Gig.*, 278v, 57: "[...] *in quo omnes peccaverunt* [...]."

I note that Jerome's *Vulgata* retained or translated the Greek as "in quo omnes peccaverunt."¹⁶³ What is more, the critical edition of the Syriac text of this passage attests readings in harmony with the *Vetus Latina* and the *Vulgata*.¹⁶⁴ A further blow to this criticism of Augustine's text also comes from the fact that Cyril of Alexandria (familiar with at least some writings of Augustine) appears to have been in possession of both textual traditions of this verse.¹⁶⁵ Still, it may be the case that Augustine (and others) developed their theological view of original sin in dialogue with this Latin translation that was amenable to a theory of inherited guilt (though Augustine himself notably avoided vocabulary of fatally inherited *culpa*).¹⁶⁶ Certainly, Augustine betrayed no familiarity with the Greek *textus receptus* of Rm. 5, 12. Yet, among the oldest Syriac witnesses, some translated Rm. 5, 12 just as Augustine. This suggests an early and legitimate reading that marks a variant from the Greek *textus receptus*. Be that as it may, Scholarios' only overt citations of Rm., 5, 12 occurred when reworking Kydones' Greek translations of the *SG* and the *ST*. There, Scholarios theologized upon Augustine's phraseology (in harmony with Aquinas) *in order to avoid* both traducianism and any literal sense of *moral guilt* in a fetus. Even if Augustine had been the remote cause of Aquinas' terminology and of his willingness to speak of putative "guilt," Scholastic Latin culture at large failed to perpetuate two essential aspects of Augustinianism. Firstly, the special creation of the soul was neither put into question by Aquinas nor by the Franciscan school with which Scholarios was acquainted. Additionally, traducianism had long been condemned, which was papally renewed in this period.¹⁶⁷ Secondly, Augustine's legalistic language was exploited and developed into a vocabulary of fetal "guilt" *by theological successors*, but its problematic nature required multiple distinctions within the Latin Scholastic lexicon, as we will see below. In short, Augustine's traducianism and related fetal hamartiology bore the hallmarks of a developed

¹⁶³ *Vulg.* 5, 12, p. 1755a.

¹⁶⁴ I thank Basil Lourié (editor of *Scrinium*) for alerting me to the Syriac evidence. For the Syriac version of Rm., 5, 12, compare NT, *Vulg.*, to *Syriac NT*.

¹⁶⁵ Cyr., *In d. Joann. Evang.*, III 18, 22, ed. P. Pusey, Oxford 1872, p. 36, 16–17: "[...] ἐπείπερ ἡμάρτομεν ἐν Αδὰμ τῷ πρώτῳ τὴν θείαν πατήσαντες ἐντολὴν [...]"] Compare Cyr., *Frag. ad Roman.*, III 5, 11, p. 182, 19–21 Pusey: "[...] διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἡμαρτον [...]"] Naturally, the former citation could hail from then extant translations of Augustine (not to mention Ambrose!) in Greek (now lost). See Dekkers 1953, 197–198, 201, 206–208, 210–212, 216 – 217.

¹⁶⁶ Beatrice 2013, 133–134.

¹⁶⁷ Denz., 360–361, p. 498. Pope Anastasius II (d. 498) condemned traducianism. However, Anastasius approved of parents transmitting *poena culpaque peccati*. The concept of "punishment" meted out to the human race proved uncontroversial. Per Leo's *Tome* at Chalcedon, the terminology became O/orthodox, but its sense was potentially misleading. During Palamas' time until the Council of Florence, well-known papal decretals condemned an alleged case of Augustinian traducianism in Armenia, as discussed per Benedict XII (d. 1342). See Denz., 1007, pp. 1340–1341.

North African tradition among both Greeks and Latins and gradually diffused itself, but not without multiple nuances.¹⁶⁸

6.2 Scholarios, Aquinas, and Original Sin

As a prelude to Scholarios' treatment of the Immaculate Conception, I only highlight in this section Scholarios' accurate understanding of Aquinas on original sin, in contradistinction to Augustine. Scholarios' concise translation of Aquinas interpreted him as teaching the following:

Now, it true that all humans sinned in Adam who sinned, not as if they would have themselves committed his sinful act, but in the sense that they belong to his nature, which was corrupted by sin (Ἀληθὲς δέ ἔστι τὸ καὶ πάντας ἀμαρτεῖν ἐν τῷ Αδὰμ ἀμαρτόντι, οὐχ ὡς ἀν αὐτοὺς ἐνεργήσαντας, ἀλλ’ ὡς τῇ ἐκείνου φύσει τῇ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας φθαρείσῃ προσήκοντας). (*Epitome of SG*)¹⁶⁹

Granted Jugie and Blanchet, who put the above translation as late as 1464, Scholarios does not waiver theologically from his life-long beliefs about transmission of original sin and the origin of the soul: (1) Human nature is corrupted, (2) The soul is created immediately by God, (3) but because of the curse decreed for Adam's lineage, God directly deprives every soul of some perfection, while infusing the soul into the body, resulting in a composite of soul and body that suffers a privation of grace.¹⁷⁰ Scholarios' position is Scholastic, not Augustinian, in that the soul suffers defect/privation, *not the body*. Human seed that is traceable to Adam merely occasions an application of the divine decree or curse to every new instantiation of human nature.

6.3 Scholarios, François Meyronnes, Original Sin, and Immaculate Conception

Scholarios had access to the works of François Meyronnes, whose Marian doctrine argues for a Marian “privilege.”¹⁷¹ For Meyronnes, divine privilege (as in Roman law) explained how “redemption” from original sin existed without needing to contract

¹⁶⁸ Beatrice 2013, 233–235.

¹⁶⁹ OCGS, V 4, 52, p. 296, 8–10. Compare SG 4, 52 [7] (Translation mine): “[...] *hoc igitur verum est dicere quod, ‘uno peccante, omnes peccaverunt in ipso’* [Rm., 5, 12] [...] *Non quod essent actu in ipso alii homines, sed virtute, sicut in originali principio. Nec dicuntur peccasse in eo quasi aliquem actum exercentes: sed in quantum pertinent ad naturam ipsius, quae per peccatum corrupta est.*”

¹⁷⁰ OCGS, I 1, 1, p. 462, 1–5: “[...] νέας ψυχὰς κτίζων ἐν νέοις σώμασιν [...] μετὰ τῆς προγονικῆς ἀμαρτίας αὐτὰς δημιουργεῖ, καὶ εἰσέρχονται τὰ σώματα, τὸν τοιοῦτον καὶ αὐτὰς ὥππον ἔχουσαι [...]”

¹⁷¹ Scholarios heartily approved Meyronnes's theology in OCGS, VI *prolog.*, p. 179, 29.

it.¹⁷² Unless we suppose Scholarios' references to Mary's "gift/s" as somehow equivalent to Meyronnes's "privilege," only impressionistic echoes, whether of Meyronnes, of Scotus, or of some other Scotistic source, are shared between the two. For example, both Scholarios and Meyronnes had access to the works of Fulgentius of Ruspe. Yet, for his part, Meyronnes adamantly opposed physicalist laws of propagation of sin.¹⁷³ Meyronnes cited Scotus' *principium mariale*, Scotus' *decuit*, and arguments for perfect mediation of a perfect mediator to justify Mary's privilege.¹⁷⁴ Meyronnes clearly emphasized the purely extrinsic nature of original sin from a putative decree of loss and consecutive punishment. In Meyronnes, Scholarios would have been completely discouraged from indulging in biological metaphors.¹⁷⁵ Meyronnes relied heavily on Anselm of Canterbury.¹⁷⁶ He expressly rejected the terminology of infection (*infectio morbida in carne*), stain (*macula*), and analogies of original sin to habits of the soul.¹⁷⁷ Meyronnes rejected both "concupiscence" as epitomizing the guilt of original sin,¹⁷⁸ and Aquinas' assertion that original sin is a bad disposition (*disposition* or διάθεσις in Scholarios) formed out of the composite human subject (versus in the soul alone).¹⁷⁹ Aquinas and Scholarios differed markedly from Meyronnes, who harmonized more with Livanos' presentation of Photios in my introduction, but with nobody else among the Palamites investigated. Lastly, Meyronnes forcefully argued that Augustine's latter *Retractationes* called into question Augustine's former traducian commitments.¹⁸⁰ Taking all this into account, Meyronnes could have proved only an obstacle to Scholarios for indulging his penchant for Augustine's and Palamas' spermatic metaphor and Augustine's language of infection. Still, Scholarios might have consulted Meyronnes for his progression of argumentation on behalf of Mary's "gift."

¹⁷² *Conflatus*, 3, 3, 2, 5, p. 165b–166a.

¹⁷³ *Conflatus*, 3, 3, 2, 4, p. 165b, and *Tractatus*, 10, p. 291a.

¹⁷⁴ *Conflatus*, 3, 3, 2, 1, pp. 165a–165b.

¹⁷⁵ *Conflatus*, 3, 3, 2, 11, pp. 166a–166b.

¹⁷⁶ *Conflatus*, 3, 3, 2, 1, p. 165a.

¹⁷⁷ *Tractatus*, 2, p. 284a–284b.

¹⁷⁸ *Conflatus*, 3, 3, 2, 8, p. 166a, and *Tractatus*, 2, pp. 284b–285a.

¹⁷⁹ *Tractatus*, 3, p. 285a–285b. Compare OCGS, VI [ST] 1–2, 82, 1, p. 96, 6–15: "It will be shown that original sin (τὸ προγονικὸν ἀμάρτημα) is a habit (ἔξις). Now, a habit is dual: first that by which some potency is moved (κινεῖται τις δύναμις) toward what is act (πρὸς τὸ ἐνέργειν), as sciences and virtues. Now, ancestral sin is not a habit in this way; secondly, a disposition of some nature (διάθεσις τινος φύσεως) from numerous compounds, following which something is well or badly stationed in relation to something else. Now, indeed, whenever such a disposition is transcribed to nature, as regards sickness and health, so is ancestral sin a habit in this way, for it is some disordered (ἄτακτος) disposition, which it produces from a dissolution of that harmony, in which the notion of health is established. Whence ancestral sin is called a sickness of nature."

¹⁸⁰ *Tractatus*, 4, p. 286b.

Scholarios, Original Sin, and Immaculate Conception

In light of the foregoing, we can now evaluate Scholarios. I present his *opera* touching on the Immaculate Conception, for the most part, in chronological order:

How shall you not be blessed, who have not only been completely ignorant of the reproaches of the first malediction, but actually are going to pull the other women, too, out of these reproaches? You are truly “blessed among women,” not merely because you were deemed worthy of gifts greater than all other women, but also because you were released from all the terrible things of the curse, and will become capable of releasing the entire human race. So too, just as the shame of the curse had been urged on from one woman, confusing the common human nature, in this manner now, from you, the beauty of benediction will revive for others and you shall become the seed of a second life¹⁸¹ and the principle of the true humans [that is, of the purified humans.] (πῶς δ' οὐ τοιαύτη, ἡ μὴ μόνον αὐτή τὰ τῆς πρώτης κατάρας ἡγνόηκας καθάπαξ ὄνειδη, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ποιήσεις ἔξω τούτων γενέσθαι; τῷδοντί γὰρ εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν, οὐ μόνον ὅτι μειζόνων ἡ κατὰ πάσας ἡξιώσαι δωρεῶν, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ τῶν τῆς κατάρας δεινῶν αὐτῇ τε ἀπολέλυσαι καὶ τὸ γένος ἀπαντάλλαξαι δυνητῇ, καὶ καθάπερ τὸ τῆς κατάρας αἴσχος ἐκ μιᾶς ὀρμηθὲν γυναικός τὴν κοινὴν συνέχει φύσιν, οὕτω καὶ νῦν παρὰ σοῦ τὸ τῆς εὐλογίας καλὸν πᾶσιν ἀναλάμψει τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ σπέρμα δευτέρου βίου γενήσῃ καὶ τῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀνθρώπων ἀρχή.).¹⁸²

[...] [Scholion on Lk., 1, 35] Flesh will not produce the conception for you as with other women, that is by means of assuming food [transforming it into seed] and contaminating what is born with its baseness, but the Holy Spirit will render, by means of what is pure, your purest flesh, a matter and will use it as sanctified, or, to put it better, will sanctify it by means of using it. Desire does not anticipate your conception, the origin of labor pains and sorrow ... (Σὰρξ οὐκ ἐνεργάσεται σοι τὴν σύλληψιν καθάπερ ταῖς ἄλλαις μεταλαμβάνουσα μὲν τροφῆς, μεταδιδούσα δὲ πονηρίας τῷ τικτομένῳ, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ὑλην τῷ καθαρῷ τὴν καθαρωτάτην σου ποιήσεται σάρκα καὶ χρήσεται μὲν ὡς ἡγιασμένη, ἀγιάσει δὲ τῷ χρήσασθαι μᾶλλον. Ἐπιθυμία μὲν οὐ φθάνει σου τὴν σύλληψιν, ὡδίνων ἀρχὴ καὶ λύπης ταύτην [...]]) [...] (On the Sermon pour la fête de l'Annonciation)¹⁸³

This sermon (*scripsit* 1437–1439) signaled Scholarios’ earliest interest in the Immaculate Conception. The force of Scholarios’ arguments and vocabulary are not entirely Byzantine. The metaphorical contrast between two lines of seed (good and evil) may have been lifted from Kabasilas, as above when he spoke in Augustinian fashion about baptism. On the vocation of Mary, Kabasilas once designated Mary as the “first

¹⁸¹ This is a brilliantly placed allusion to Mary’s seed fulfilling the protoevangelium prophecy in LXX Gn., 3, 15: “καὶ ἔχθραν [= ὁ ὄφις] θήσω ἀνὰ μέσον σου καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς γυναικός καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σπέρματός σου καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς· αὐτός σου τηρήσει κεφαλήν, καὶ σὺ τηρήσεις αὐτού πτέρναν.”

¹⁸² OCGS, I 42, p. 40, 15–23.

¹⁸³ OCGS, I 46, p. 44, 36, p. 45, 1–5 (Translation mine).

human,” or the equivalent “principle” of human nature.¹⁸⁴ A more likely culprit, however, is Planudes’ rendering of Augustine, which so clearly influenced Palamas’ *Homily 52*. It seems to be the inspiration for designating physical seed as a spiritual principle of death and life.¹⁸⁵ Theologically, relying on Palamas, Scholarios is here entirely “Byzantine,” developing Maximos’ absolute primacy of Christ as it might involve Mary in the redemption. Palamas inspired this theme, where Mary was called αἰτία of all prior and posterior creation.¹⁸⁶ Still, Scholarios’ turgid sermon betrays Scholastic modes of speaking and smacks of vocabulary common to the Kydones brothers’ translations of Aquinas and Augustine. Instead of repeating the succinct patristic phraseology common to prepurification, or simply reproducing antecedent Palamite wording, Scholarios’ rhetoric obliquely referenced Mary’s prepurification at the Annunciation by calling the incarnate Word’s flesh “purest” through what is already “pure.” In this context, no stereotypically Latin theme of guilt in relation to Adam’s inheritance is present. In general, Scholarios only rarely mentions “guilt” as something unqualifiedly remitted at baptism.¹⁸⁷ Lastly, there is a contrast of Eve’s desire for her husband and her labor pains with Mary’s lack of concupiscence and virginal birthing process. While this theme was universal by Scholarios’ time, the contrast means to imply that Mary was exempt from Augustine’s “desire for the flesh” affecting the rest of humanity (as I investigate below).

Jugie also argued that Scholarios had held the Immaculate Conception in his sermon *Sermon pour la fête de la Présentation* (21 November 1449). Now, as an anti-unionist in league with Markos of Ephesus, Scholarios nonetheless composed this tribute to Mary. Although Jugie’s arguments are certainly complementary to his overall thesis, the sermon in question made no explicit reference to sinful flesh, original sin, or Mary’s explicit exemption therefrom. Therefore, I pass on to the sermon *Homélie sur la Dormition de la Sainte Vierge* (1464), which represents Scholarios’ mature thought. Scholarios introduced the section below by explaining that Mary acquired her graces without her own efforts that are typically required for Aristotelian habits (ἔξεις) as exercised by repetition. In this, he curiously coincided with Meyronnes’s *ex professo* treatise on the Immaculate Conception.¹⁸⁸ Unfortunately, Scholarios’ idiosyncratic style makes it impossible to locate verbatim dependence on a source:

¹⁸⁴ See Jugie 1914, 529, where Scholarian dependence on Kabasilas’ Mariology has already been demonstrated.

¹⁸⁵ Aug. and Planud., *περὶ Τριαδ.*, II 13, 18, 23, p. 761, 3–20, p. 763, 38–41 Παπαθωμόπουλος/Τσαβαρή/Rigotti.

¹⁸⁶ *Homiliae*, IX 14, 15, p. 394, 15.

¹⁸⁷ For a typical example lacking reference to guilt, see his sermon *On the Birthday of Jesus* in OCGS, I 9, p. 231, 21–34. Shortly afterward he does propose a relatively rare instance of “original/ancestral guilt” in OCGS, I 10, p. 233, 9–15.

¹⁸⁸ *Tractatus*, 7, pp. 296b–297a. Meyronnes argued both infused and natural virtues were gifted at conception.

[God] granted [...] her soul to possess [the virtues] of heaven, with the result that one cannot find in her the least trace of the deficiencies of our nature. And, what the conception without seed energized in him who is the one born from her, the same thing the divine grace also energized exactly in herself, who was born by means of seed. Consequently, an astonishing purity would be in both. First, in the Son born from her, this purity is more gloriously due to his nature, which sustains no alleged cause of blemish. Then, in the bearer of the born, this purity belongs only by grace so as she is absolutely pure from the very moment of his being born, since she was to bear the purest Son, even if she had an alleged reason by nature for a blemish at conception. Whence, everything was in harmony with the purity of the first and last most blessed mother among humans (έδίδου [...] οὐρανόθεν συγκαταβεβλήσθαι τῇ φύσει, ὡς ἀν οὕτω μηδ' ἔχος τι τῶν τῆς φύσεως ὑστερημάτων ταύτη συνῇ, καὶ ὅπερ ἡ σπέρματος ἄνευ σύλληψις ἐν τῷ παρ' αὐτῆς γεννηθέντι, τοῦτ' αὐτῇ καὶ διὰ σπέρματος γεννηθείσῃ ἡ θεία χάρις ἐνήργει, ὡς ἀν καὶ ἐν ἀμφοῖν ἡ καθαρότης ξενίζουσα τῷ μὲν ἐξ αὐτῆς γεννωμένῳ καὶ διὰ τὴν φύσιν ἐνδοξότερον ἢ οὐδεμίαν ρύπου πρόφασιν ἔχουσαν, τῇ δὲ τοῦτον γεννώσῃ κατὰ χάριν προσῆπον καὶ ἡ καθαρωτάτη γεννηθεῖσα εὐθύς, ὡς δὴ μέλλουσα τὸν καθαρώτατον τίκτειν, καίτοι τοῦ ρύπου πρόφασιν ἔχουσα τῇ φύσει συνοῦσαν. Ὅθεν τῇ καθαρειότητι τῆς οὔτως εύτυχεστάτης ἐν τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων φύσει μητρὸς καὶ πρώτης καὶ τελευταίας πάντ' ἣν ἀκόλουθα [...] [...] (*Homélie sur la Dormition de la Sainte Vierge*)¹⁸⁹

Sinlessness “by grace” and/or “by nature” had become a distinction by the time of Damascene and was also employed in Palamas.¹⁹⁰ Jugie mistakenly attributed this to the invention of Schoolmen.¹⁹¹ Damascene suffices as the source of medical suppositions regarding feminine seed and the all-pure seed of Joachim.¹⁹² Scholarios’ preoccupation with Thomistic literature concerned its imputation of blemish to Mary. Scholarios’ old master, Bryennios, had earlier established that a prepurified conception of Mary bequeathed a participation of grace to her all-pure nature. Consequently, Scholarios’ immaculatism appears to be more consonant with previous Byzantine reactions to Dominican Mariology. To this extent, nothing need be attributed to Scotism.

Nevertheless, Scotism might be hypothesized to have influenced Scholarios. Jugie located a final passage in Scholarios that unequivocally affirmed the Immaculate Conception:

¹⁸⁹ OGCS, I 8–9, p. 202, 28, 32–38, p. 203, 1–6 (Translation mine).

¹⁹⁰ Apropos, there is Christ who is super-excellent by nature and grace, while Mary is transformed by grace, but not in her nature. For one example, see *Homiliae XI* 52, 61, p. 342, 1–9. A division between sinlessness by nature and by grace is, in my view, key to solving the puzzle proposed in Sherwood 1962, 384–385, wherein Palamas is critiqued for a *nolens volens* Mariology, whereby an immaculate conception is established by generational purification, but seemingly negated by denying her “the sinlessness” of Christ (by nature).

¹⁹¹ Jugie 1952, 304.

¹⁹² Damasc., *In nativ. BMV*, 2, ed. Kotter, Berlin 1988, p. 170, 11–14: “[...] Ὑπόχρεος ὑμῖν ἔστι πᾶσα ἡ φύσις: δι' ὑμῶν γὰρ προσήγαγε δῶρον τῷ κτίστῃ δώρων ἀπάντων ὑπερφερέστερον, μητέρᾳ σεμνήν, μόνην ἀξίαν τοῦ κτίσαντος. Ω δόσφυς τοῦ Ἰωακεὶμ παμμακάριστε, ἐξ ἣς κατεβλήθη σπέρμα πανάμωμον.”

He took for himself this [a body] only according to human nature. For the specifying power of the body was not from our forefather but was from the Holy Spirit.¹⁹³ The all-holy virgin, in terms of her having been born through seed, would not have been without participation in ancestral sin; even though her parents were incomparable in virtue, they too shared in the inheritance. Yet, once for all, the grace of God made her exempt,¹⁹⁴ just as if she had been born without seed, in order to provide her flesh for the incarnation of the Word of God in an entirely pure state. Therefore, as she was made exempt once and for all from original guilt and punishment, taking the gift alone among all mankind,¹⁹⁵ she had a soul totally inaccessible to things that cloud reasoning, and in this way she became a divine temple in body and soul ([...] τοῦτο κατὰ μόνην εἰλήφει τὴν φύσιν· ἡ γὰρ εἰδοποιὸς τοῦ σώματος δύναμις οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ προπάτορος, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος ἦν. Ή δὲ παναγίᾳ παρθένος τῷ μὲν ἐκ σπέρματος γεγεννήσθαι τῆς προγονικῆς ἀμαρτίας οὐκ ἄν ἀμέτοχος ἦν, καίτοι τῶν γονέων ἀπαραβλήτων ὅντων ἐξ ἀρετήν, μετεῖχον δὲ κάκενοι τοῦ κλήρου· ἀλλ’ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ καθάπαξ αὐτὴν ἀπήλλαξεν, ὥστε ἄν εἰ καὶ χωρὶς ἐγίνετο σπέρματος, ἵνα τῇ τοῦ θείου λόγου σαρκώσει πάντη καθαράν ὑπόσχῃ τὴν σάρκα. Ὄθεν ὡς ἀπηλλαγμένη καθάπαξ τῆς προγονικῆς ἐνοχῆς καὶ ποινῆς καὶ μόνη πάντων ἀνθρώπων τουτὶ λαβοῦσα τὸ δῶρον, ἀνεπίβατον καὶ τοῖς νέφεσι τῶν λογισμῶν ἔσχε παντάπασι τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ σαρκὶ καὶ ψυχῇ θείον οὕτω γέγονε τέμενος [...]]) [...]) (*Second traité sur l'origine de l'âme*)¹⁹⁶

Written in 1459–1460, the outstanding phrase in this Scholarian passage is “original guilt.” Scholarios’ phrase looks suspiciously like that of his teacher, Makres, who had relied directly on Aquinas (SG, 4, 50–52). Makres mentioned ancestral guilt and “impulse,” which Scholarios might have reworded as “punishment.” Scholarios was likely encouraged to incorporate Makres’ terminology because of his love for Aquinas, who was absconded within Makres *opera*.

Earlier in the same work, as an introduction to the Immaculate Conception and baptism as remitting original sin and punishment, Scholarios asserted:

[...] We are are baptized into death (Rm., 6, 3). Now, it is very much so that seed was accustomed to produce and still produces distributable ancestral sin and punishment, arriving in succession from that [famous Adamite] root. Not only this, but even desire foretook him who both had sown seed, in which it is sown, and also mediates the desire for the flesh, through which the seeded are conceived. These, too, are the corollaries themselves with original sin and its participation in all subsequent peoples. So, too, as there is a double creative principle of this sort of body; namely, seed and its giver [...] A father is the cause of seed [...] ([...] εἰς τὸν Θάνατον αὐτοῦ βαπτίζόμεθα. Ἐποιεῖ δὲ καὶ ποιεῖ διαδόσιμον τὴν προγονικὴν ἀμαρτίαν τε καὶ ποινὴν μάλιστα μὲν τὸ σπέρμα, ὡς ἐκ τῆς ρίζης ἐκείνης ἡκον διαδοχῆς οὐκ αὐτὸ δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ προλαμβάνουσα τοῦ τε σπείροντος ἐπιθυμία καὶ ἐν ᾧ σπείρεται καὶ ἡ μεσιτεύουσα τῆς σαρκὸς

¹⁹³ Meyronnes similarly discussed and concluded as much, but no obvious correspondence of vocabulary exists. Their similarity might depend on common sources. Compare *Conflatus*, 3, 3, 2, 8–11, pp. 166a–166b.

¹⁹⁴ This may hint of *praeservatio* in *Tractatus*, 10, pp. 289a–290b.

¹⁹⁵ This potentially corresponds to Mary’s *donum supernaturale* (original justice) in *Tractatus*, 1, 283a–284b. Contrariwise, Meyronnes objected to biological analogies and physical propagation to explain original sin’s transmission.

¹⁹⁶ OCGS, I 2, 20, p. 501, 20–30. I have adapted the English translation from Livanos 2006a, 39.

ὅρεξις, δι' ἣς σπειρόμενοι συλλαμβάνονται· ἀ καὶ αὐτὰ τῇ προγονικῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ καὶ τῇ ταύτης ἐν τοῖς ὑστέροις πᾶσι μεθέξει ἀκόλουθα. Καὶ καθάπερ διπλῆ τοῦ τοιοῦδε σώματος ἡ ποιητικὴ ἀρχή, τό τε σπέρμα καὶ ὁ τοῦτο διδούς, εἰ καὶ τρόπον ἔτερον [...] ὁ πατὴρ ὁ τοῦ σπέρματος αἴτιος [...]) [...] (Second traité sur l'origine de l'âme)¹⁹⁷

If we compare this to Palamas' *Homily 52*, accepting Augustinian influence there, we see that Scholarios performed a sort of strengthening of Palamas' metaphor. Really, Scholarios' discourse on seed, immediately above, serves as almost a gloss on Palamas and Augustine. However, Scholarios did not exactly cite Augustine *ad litteram*, nor the strict vocabulary of Planudes, when he spoke of "seed and its giver." Nevertheless, it is possible for Scholarios to have been playing with Palamas' idea (that we saw above) that Adam's infected nature/seed transmitted (ἀναδιδωμένην) its poison to human nature.¹⁹⁸ Scholarios simply explicitated Palamas' innuendo regarding seed as the agent of transmission of original sin. This almost singular phraseology among Greek texts of the Augustinian "desire for the flesh" might derive either directly from Planudes, or indirectly from Aquinas *graecus* (cited below). Because Scholarios left nothing to the imagination in his above mentioned discussion of seed, one might be tempted to see Scholarios completely enamoured of Augustinian traducianism or some literal infection of the flesh so as to exclude Aquinas from the text above. After all, these metaphors feel and sound very traducian. On the contrary, in harmony with Damascene, Scotus, and Meyronnes, Scholarios absolutely affirms in *Second traité sur l'origine de l'âme* that the soul (instantly created by God contra traducianism) is immediately infused at conception (rejecting Aquinas' delayed ensoulment).¹⁹⁹ In the same treatise, Scholarios even discussed Augustine's account of the infusion of the soul, though ultimately leaving it behind.²⁰⁰ Next, Scholarios also took up Aquinas' position of successive plant, animal, and human soul-forms *in utero*.²⁰¹ Ultimately, Scholarios refrained from naming Aquinas explicitly to save him the dishonor of rejecting his theory in favor of Damascene (or less likely: Scotus, or Meyronnes). What are we to make of such a hodge-podge?

Although Scotism might be suspected of directly inspiring the idea of exemption from original sin, the tradition of the prepurified must first be definitively excluded, not an easy task. Importantly, when Scholarios used physicalist language, it was to provide his reader with an attractive analogy or metaphor that had long been absorbed into Palamism. Here, Scholarios is also imitative of the vocabulary of Thomism. Non-Augustinian and non-Palamite "distributable seed" was a metaphor of Aquinas *graecus*. With Aquinas, unlike Meyronnes, Scholarios was able to honor Augustine's lan-

¹⁹⁷ OCGS, I 2, 17, p. 499, 15–23 (Translation mine).

¹⁹⁸ *Homiliae*, IX 5, 1–2, p. 142, 1–11.

¹⁹⁹ OCGS, I 2, 19, p. 500, 1–4.

²⁰⁰ OCGS, I 2, 11, p. 495, 13–18.

²⁰¹ OCGS, I 2, 12, p. 495, 24–36, p. 496, 1–18.

guage and examples, but also was able to transform “infected flesh” into a *metaphor* to describe the effects of concupiscence after the privation of grace in the soul. Aquinas inspired this vocabulary from the passage above:

Nowadays, children are likened to their parents as regards original sin, which is so called “physical sin” and is said to be transmitted along with [human] nature. In this way would children be likened to their very parents with regard to original justice, which belongs to the human species in an accidental way, not having as a cause the principles of the species, but being some sort of gift given from God to the entire [human] nature ([...] νῦν οἱ παῖδες δομοῦνται τοῖς γονεῦσι κατὰ τὴν προγονικὴν ἀμαρτίαν, φυσικὸν ἀμάρτημα λεγομένην καὶ μετὰ τῆς φύσεως διαδιδομένην, οὕτως ὡμοίωντο ἂν καὶ τότε αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν προγονικήν, συμβεβηκός ὅνσαν τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ εἶδει, οὐ τὰς ἀρχὰς τοῦ εἶδους αἴτιον ἔχον, ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ τι δῶρον θεόθεν δεδομένον ὅλῃ τῇ φύσει.). (*Epitome of ST*)²⁰²

Scholarios' *Second traité sur l'origine de l'âme* explained transmission of sin in these very terms. The phrase: “physical sin” can be misleading without taking into account the term's etymology and Scholastic sense. “Physical” simply refers to something that is “of nature.” Taking human nature as a matter-soul composite, Scholarios traced the sinfulness or infection of the flesh back to the soul immediately infused by God, being as it was, imperfect without original justice, or some similar grace. Consequently, in every such instance of human nature – brought about by a spermatic cause – God infuses a graceless soul into the naturally formed human fetal body. Because such a composite is spiritually defective, always occasioned by participation in the spermatic lineage of Adam (as consequence of a decree of divine justice), infection or physical sin is predicated of the whole and, therefore, includes the flesh as a part of the whole. Lastly, according to the Scholarian version of Aquinas *graecus*, original justice is the alternative remedy or accident (gift) infusible by God at the soul's creation. Could Scholarios' solution to the problem of Mary's allegedly defective soul (via Aquinas), simply be to introduce a positive divine decree to infuse Aquinas' aforesaid “gift” in anticipation of her divine maternity? Vocabulary, context, and method of argumentation do suggest that Scholarios had some recourse to Scotism. Elsewhere, *Second traité sur l'origine de l'âme* obliquely referred to the Byzantine notion of the prepurified Mary and biological assumptions (contra Aquinas) that can be sufficiently accounted for by recourse to Palamas and Damascene.

²⁰² OCGS, V [ST] 100, 1, p. 479, 8–13. Compare ST, 1, 100, *corpus* (Translation mine): “[...] naturaliter homo generat sibi simile secundum speciem. Unde quaecumque accidentia consequuntur naturam speciei, in his necesse est quod filii parentibus similentur, nisi sit error in operatione naturae, qui in statu innocentiae non fuisset. In accidentibus autem individualibus non est necesse quod filii parentibus similentur. Iustitia autem originalis, in qua primus homo conditus fuit, fuit accidentis naturae speciei, non quasi ex principiis speciei causatum, sed sicut quoddam donum divinitus datum toti naturae. Et hoc appareat, quia opposita sunt unius generis, peccatum autem originale, quod opponitur illi iustitiae, dicitur esse peccatum naturae; unde traducitur a parente in posteros. Et propter hoc etiam filii parentibus assimilati fuissent quantum ad originalem iustitiam.”

Lastly, Scholarios had read the *ST* in the early 1430s, subsequently even translating a relevant Augustinian passage (whether at that time or later) on original sin that defines original sin as concupiscence. Though Augustine's definition of original sin as concupiscence was *verbally* respected, Aquinas completely reinterpreted (or neutered) Augustine's rather forthright assertion:

Thirdly, it is the case that this is a desire, for Augustine says in the book *Retractions*: “Desire is the guilt of original sin” (Τρίτον, ὅτι τοῦτο ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἔστιν· φησὶ γὰρ Αὐγουστῖνος ἐν τῷ *Tāv διορθώσεων* βιβλίῳ, “Ἡ ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἔστιν ἡ ἐνοχὴ τοῦ προγονικοῦ ἀμαρτήματος.”). (*Epitome of the ST*)²⁰³

Aquinas went on to reduce this definition to mean that, as the result of the privation of original justice in the spiritual entity of soul, desire or concupiscence arises out of the body-soul composition coming into being.²⁰⁴ Augustine, as viewed through Aquinas (along with Palamas' extended metaphor of a satanic root), appears to be Scholarios' primary source for his picturesque doctrine. Scholarios never felt that Palamas and Aquinas needed to be opposed on this point. Returning to Scholarios' use of Palamas, he seamlessly combined (*scripsit* 1459–1460) Aquinas' version of Augustinian doctrine along with his beloved Palamas. Importantly, Scholarios is currently unique among all Palamites (let alone Byzantines) to reproduce Palamas *ad litteram* on the subject of original sin as follows:

[God] saves [...] by baptism, that is, people seek the door of heavenly life to be opened and to be loosed from ancestral responsibility (σῶζει [...] τῷ βαπτίσματι δηλονότι, τῆς προγονικῆς ἀπολυμένους εὐθύνης καὶ τὴν τῆς οὐρανίου ζωῆς πύλην ἀνεῳγμένην εὐρίσκοντας [...]]) [...] (*Lot of Souls post mortem*)²⁰⁵

We should recall that, besides Scholarios, only Palamas had ever employed the neologism “ancestral responsibility.”²⁰⁶ Consequently, Scholarios proved his own ideas about Adamite seed, desire for the flesh, and ancestral sin, and baptism were (at least partially) from Palamas' *Homily 16: On Holy and Great Saturday*:

God was not only born among men but, according to the prophets, born of a holy Virgin far above all defiled thoughts of the flesh. It was the Holy Spirit's coming upon her, not desire for the flesh, that caused the Virgin to conceive, and the conception was preceded by good tidings and faith in God's indwelling, not acceptance and experience of passionate desire (Διὰ τοῦτο οὐ μόνον Θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ Παρθένου ἀγίας καὶ μεμολυσμένων λογισμῶν τῶν

²⁰³ OCGS, VI [ST] 1–2, 82, 3, p. 96, 18–20 (Translation mine). Compare *ST*, 1–2, 82, 3, *sed contra*: “*Sed contra est quod Augustinus dicit, in libro Retract., ‘concupiscentia est reatus originalis peccati.’*”

²⁰⁴ *ST*, 1–2, 82, 3, *corpus*.

²⁰⁵ OCGS, I 3, p. 510, 4–6 (Translation mine).

²⁰⁶ A thorough tabulation of Greek literature (TLG) located –besides Scholarios and Palamas above – no other author writing thus in Greek literature. See, too, Palam., *CL*, p. 55, 15–16, *Homiliae*, 31, 5, p. 284, 3–4.

ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ἀνωτέρας κατὰ τοὺς προφήτας γεννᾶται, Παρθένου ἡς τὴν σύλληψιν ἀγίου Πνεύματος ἐπέλευσις, οὐ σαρκὸς ἐπήνεγκεν ὅρεξις, εὐαγγελισμός καὶ πίστις Θεοῦ ἐνδημίας, ἀλλ’ οὐ συγκατάθεσις καὶ πεῖτα ἐμπαθοῦς ἐπιθυμίας προείληφε [...]]²⁰⁷

I note that Palamas self-plagiarized verbatim his own *Homily 52* (or vice versa), as cited earlier above. If we compare either *Homily 16* or *Homily 52* to Planudes' translation, virginal conception (παρθένος, σύλληψις), flesh (σάρξ), desire (ἐπιθυμία), and especially fleshly desire (σαρκὸς ὅρεξις) all predominate.²⁰⁸ Furthermore, Augustine, as Palamas and Scholarios, saw Mary as the principle (ἀρχή) or root of good flesh in opposition to the bad flesh of original sin (cf. Aug. *De Trin.*, 13, 18, 23).

A full comparison of texts highlights numerous features common to Augustine, Palamas, and Scholarios. If the rare phrase “desire for the flesh” occurs in all three authors, the only one other instance of this phrase, which I am able to locate in patristic literature is not clearly in relation to original sin. Nonetheless, even this phrase may derive from older Greek translations of Augustine.²⁰⁹ Admittedly, Scholarios indulged in idiosyncratic language smacking of biologism more than either Augustine's *De Trinitate*, or Palamas' *Homilies 16* and *Homily 52*. For his part, Palamas avoided Augustine's *traducian* tone of infection. Indeed, Scholarios' familiarity with various passages from Augustine and his own default preference for Aquinas encouraged him to indulge in these biological metaphors. Albeit Aquinas revered Augustine verbally and as an *auctoritas*, Scholarios nonetheless distanced himself from exaggeratedly physicalist descriptions of original sin typical of Augustinian traducianism. In-

²⁰⁷ *Homiliae*, IX 16, 5, p. 428, 16–21 (Engl. tr., p. 117).

²⁰⁸ Augustinian influence of original sin within this homily was first argued in Likoudis 2007, 149.

²⁰⁹ Cyril had contact with and verifiable knowledge of Augustine's works. See Lyonnet 1961, 14–25, Dunn 2006, 63–88, and van Loon 2013, 61–84. Strong evidence for several translations, as well as some fragments, exists per Dekkers 1952, 197–217. Some scholars have appealed to Cyril distinguishing between actual sin of Adam and its effects on “nature” as distancing Cyril from Augustine in Cyr. *Fragm. in Roman.*, 5, 18, p. 186, 1–31, p. 187, 1–1. On the contrary, Cyril's distinctions did not violate Augustine's own positions. In fact, one must read the aforementioned citation in dialogue with Cyril's commentary on LXX Ps., 50 (popular in North African hamartiology). Cyril was unequalled in Greek in his gloss on: “I was conceived in unlawfulness,” as if employing Augustinian material. For example, from a large amount of material, see only the first section in Cyr., *Expl. super Psalm.*, 50, 7, ed. J.-P. Migne, Paris 1864, col. 1092A–C: “Ἐθος τοῖς ἀγίοις ἐκμειλισσεθαι Θεὸν καὶ καλεῖν εἰς ἔλεον διὰ πλειστων μὲν ὄσων ἔσθ’ ὅτε φωνῶν, πλὴν καὶ διὰ γε τοῦ κατηγορεῖν ἐπείγεσθαι τῆς ἐνούσης ἀσθενείας τῇ ἀνθρώπου φύσει [...] Ἰώβ, ἀνεφώνει πρὸς Θεόν: “Ἡ οὐχ ὥσπερ γάλα με ἡμελάξας [...]” Τοσοῦτον δή τοι καὶ νῦν διὰ τῶν προκειμένων στίχων ὑποδηλούσθαι φαμεν. Αὐτὴν γάρ ήμῶν τῆς γενέσεως τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐ δίχα ῥύπου φιλοσαρκίας γενέσθαι φησί. Τίμος μὲν γάρ ὁμοιογουμένως ὁ γάμος καὶ πέρα διαβολῆς τὸ χρῆμα παρὰ Θεῷ. Πλὴν εἴ τις πειρεγάσαιτο τῆς συνόδου τὴν πρόφασιν, ὅρεξιν εὑρήσει σαρκός ... αὐτῖν, κανὸν μὴ ἐπαζύνηται ὡς ἀλμαρτία τὸ δρώμενον. Κολάζεται γοῦν ἡ σύνοδος, ἐὰν μὴ νόμον ἔχῃ τὸν βραβευτήν, καὶ παιδοποίας ἔφεσιν τὴν ἀληθῆ τοῦ πράγματος ἀφορμήν. Ούκοῦν, τὸ γε ἦκον εἰς ὅρεξεις μόνας καὶ κίνημα σαρκικόν, ἐν ἀνομίαις ἡμῶν ἡ σύλληψις, καὶ ἐν ἀλμαρτίαις κισσῶσιν αἱ μητέρες. Εἰ δὲ ῥίζαν ἔχει τὴν φιλοσαρκίαν τῶν σωμάτων ἡ γένεσις, νοσεῖ που πάντως αὐτή, καὶ τὰ ἔξ αὐτῆς γεννώμενα [...]

stead Scholarios favored underlining original sin as a privation of immaterial grace or “original justice.” For his part, Scholarios developed a *Palamite reception* of language and metaphor reflecting Augustinianism and, though extending these metaphors into a more expansive narrative. He explicitly distanced himself from traducianism and any allegedly erroneous notion of morally culpable “original guilt” as applied to a fetus *in utero*.

Conclusions

In the first part of our study, we encountered modern and contemporary *ex professo* Orthodox scholars who offered their preliminary impressions of Scholarios. They now appear to have misjudged Scholarios on the question of his sources and method for arriving at his doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and original sin. In the second part, we saw that Roman Catholic scholars tended toward exuberant enthusiasm wherever dependence of Scholarios on Latin Schoolmen, especially Aquinas, might be inferred. Outside the purview of both narratives, Gregorios Palamas was discovered not only to depend on Augustine for seminal ideas on Trinitarian theology, but also to be influenced by Augustine’s explanation of original sin. Although Palamas failed to adopt Planudes’ explicitly and idiosyncratically Greek attribution of *guilt* to everybody under the Adamite curse, Palamas found that seed and plant analogies supplied attractive preaching material that graphically conveyed the mode by which the satanic poison of original sin was passed down to humans of his own generation. In league with the tradition of the prepurification of Mary, Palamas expanded the range of Mary’s life that had been affected by purifications so as to exempt the virginal root of the Christ from taint. Consequently, Mary proved entirely free of infection and always apt to supply flesh to Jesus.

Palamas’ contemporary, Nicholas Kabasilas, was equally disposed toward Augustinianism in his sacramentology and theory of original sin. What is more, Kabasilas had recourse to Aquinas *graecus* so as to rearrange *ST*, 3, 27, in order to exempt Mary from the Augustinian curse of infected flesh in a manner befitting her traditional dignity in Byzantine Mariology. Demetrios Kydones was a likely inspiration, if not the unique source, for Kabasilas’ inverted (anti-)Thomistic method of approaching the question. Thereafter, our sampling of the Palamite school led us to understand that Augustinian teachings and metaphors were welcomed into Palamite hamarteology, likely in imitation of the forerunner Palamas. Augustinian theology continued to increase in influence until its culmination in the works of Markos of Ephesus and Georgios-Gennadios Scholarios.

Scholarios adopted the metaphors of Adamite root and infection to explain the transmission of original sin, developing and citing Palamas and members of his posterior school. Because of Scholarios’ greater access to both Greek translations and

Latin manuscripts of Augustine's work, Scholarios unsurprisingly provided his readers with a more generous fare from the Augustinian corpus. Even Scholarios' adoption of phrases, such as "original guilt," was hardly innovative by his own time. Through Scholarios' Palamite teachers, Augustine (and perhaps Fulgentius of Ruspe) had already made a substantial impact on Byzantine theologians. It is true that Scholarios was unusually bold to cite Aquinas openly, even commanding him as a theologian. Nonetheless, Scholarios' Palamite educators had been willing to cite and employ Aquinas, although they consistently omitted his name from their pages, almost as if a case of *damnatio memoriae*. All the same, Scholarios was no inventor, but rather a synthesizer of a Latino-Greek anthropology and Mariology, which imitated an *au courant* practice in the Palamite school. On the precise question of the Immaculate Conception, Scholarios expressly had access to Scotists who were generally unavailable to his monolingual Palamite predecessors. However, on this particular question of Mary's all-holiness, we find only faint echoes of Scotism to solve the riddle of the origin of Mary's "gift." Instead, having looked at Scholarios' use of Augustine, Damascene, Aquinas, Palamas, Kabasilas, Symeon of Thessalonica, and Makres, sufficient evidence and the principle of parsimony persuade us to conclude that Scholarios never strayed far from sources already in common use among Palamites. Indeed, Scholarios employed these sources better to speak in more systematic fashion about original sin and to exempt Mary from its orbit. In short, if Palamas and the canonized saints of his school embody the "The Orthodox Tradition" of theologizing in the second millennium, then Scholarios deserves an honorific seat at their table.²¹⁰

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abbreviations

Alberigo	<i>Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta</i> . G. Alberigo (editor). Bologna, 1973
Bryen.	Joseph Bryennios, Ἰωσήφ μοναχοῦ τοῦ βριεννίου τὰ εύρεθέντα. D. Tsafara, E. Boulgares (editors). Vol. 1–3. Thessaloniki, 1990
Chalc.	<i>Concilium Universale Chalcedonense anno 451</i> . In E. Schwartz (editor): <i>Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum</i> . T. 2, 1, 1, Berlin, 1962.
Chrestou	Gregorios Palamas, <i>Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ συγγράμματα</i> . In P. Chrestou (editor): "Ελληνες Πατερες τῆς Εκκλησίας. Vol. 1–11, Thessaloniki, 1962–1992.

²¹⁰ I am grateful to the following for their suggested corrections: Dr. Denis Searby (Stolckholm, SE), Dr. P. Athanasopoulos (Patras, GR), Dr. H.-M. Congourdeau (UMR 8167, Paris), Dr. J.A. Demetracopoulos (Patras, GR), Dr. Trent Pomplun (Loyola, Baltimore, MD), Adam Kemner (St. Ambrose, Davenport, IA), and Alexis Bugnolo (Rome, IT).

<i>Cod. Gig.</i>	<i>Codex Gigas librorum</i> , Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, A. 148, fols. 279r–279v
<i>Cod. Par.</i>	<i>Codex Parisinus graecus</i> 1213, 325r–354v
<i>Conflatus</i>	François Meyronnes, <i>In libros Sententiarum. In In libros Sententiarum, Quodlibeta, Tractatus formalitatum, De primo principio, Terminorum theologicalium declarationes, De univocatione</i> . Venice, 1520. Fols. 1a–227a
<i>Denz.</i>	<i>Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum (Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals: Latin-English)</i> . H. Denzinger, P. Hünermann, R. Fastiggi (editors). San Francisco, 2012
<i>Grundriss</i>	J.A. Demetracopoulos, <i>Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie Begründet von F. Überweg</i> , in G. Kapriev (ed.), <i>Die Philosophie des Mittelalters: Die byzantinische Philosophie</i> . Vol. 1, 1, Basel (forthcoming)
<i>Homiliai</i>	Gregorios Palamas, <i>Ωμιλίες 1–63</i> . In P. Chrestou (editor): Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ ἄποντα τὰ ἔργα. Vol. 9–11. Ἔλληνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἑκκλησίας. T. 72–74, Thessaloniki, 2004–2009
<i>JAS</i>	Ἡ θεῖα λειτουργία τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰακώβου τοῦ αδελφοθέου καὶ τὰ νέα σιναϊτικὰ χειρόγραφα. A. Καζαμίας (editor). Thessalonica, 2006
<i>NT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece, Based on the work of Eberhard and Erwin Nestle</i> . B. K. Aland, J. B. Karavidopoulos, C. Martini, B. Metzger (editors). Stuttgart, 2012
<i>OCGS</i>	Georgios-Gennadios Scholarios, <i>Oeuvres Complètes de Georges Scholarios</i> . L. Petit, X. Sidéridès, M. Jugie (editors). Vol. 1–8. Paris, 1928–1935
<i>PO</i>	<i>Documents Relatifs au Concile de Florence: La Question du Purgatoire à Ferrare</i> . In L. Petit (editor): <i>Documents 1–6. Patrologia Orientalis</i> . T. 15, Paris, 1927
<i>SG</i>	<i>Summa contra Gentiles</i>
<i>ST</i>	<i>Summa Theologiae</i>
<i>Syriac NT</i>	<i>Syriac NT and Psalms</i> , G. Gwilliam, J. Gwynn, R. Gilgore (editors). Istanbul, 1991
<i>Tractatus</i>	François Meyronnes, <i>Tractatus Conceptione B. Mariae Virginis R. P. Francisci Mayronis, Ordinis Minorum, qui Doctor Illuminatus vulgo dictus</i> . In Petrus de Alva et Asotrga (editor): <i>Monumenta Antiqua Seraphica, pro Immaculata Conceptione Virginis Mariae, ex Variis Auctoribus Religionis Seraphicae in Unum comportata et collecta</i> . Louvain, 1665. Cols. 283–316

Primary Sources

Ambrose of Milan, *Apologia David altera*. In Carolus Schenkl (editor): *S. Ambrosii opera. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. T. 32, 2, Vienna, 1898. Pp. 299–408 [= Ambr. *Apol. Dav. alt.*]

Ambrose of Milan, *Traité sur l’Évangile de s. Luc*. In Gabriel Tissot (editor): *Sources Chrétiennes*. T. 45, 1, Paris, 1956 [= Ambr., *Expos. Evang. sec.*]

Thomas Aquinus and Gennadius Scholarios, *Florilegium Thomisticum*. In J.A. Demetracopoulos (editor): *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévaux: Forschungen zur Theologie und Philosophie des Mittelalters*. T. 69, 1, Leuven 2002. Pp. 124–147 [= Aquin. and Schol., *Flor. Thom.*]

Aurelius Augustine, *S. Aurelii Augustini Hippomensis episcopi contra Julianum, Haeresis Pelagianae defensorem, libri sex*. In Jacques Paul Migne (editor): *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*. T. 44, Paris, 1866. Cols. 641–874 [= Aug., *Contra Jul.*]

Aurelius Augustine, *De nuptiis et concupiscentia ad Valerium comitem libri duo*. In C. Urba, I. Zycha (editors): *Sancti Aurelii Augustini opera. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiastorum Latinorum*. T. 42, 8, 2, Vienna, 1902. Pp. 211–319 [= Aug., *De nupt. concept.*]

Aurelius Augustine, *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*. In C. Urba, I. Zycha (editors): *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Sancti Aurelii Augustini opera*. T. 60, 8, 1, Vienna, 1913. Pp. 423–570 [= Aug., *Contra duas ep. Pelag.*]

Aurelius Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de patimso parvolorum ad marcellinum libri tres*. In C. Urba, I. Zycha (editors): *Sancti Aurelii Augustini opera. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiastorum Latinorum*. T. 60, 8, 1, Vienna, 1913. Pp. 1–151 [= Aug., *De pecc. merit.*]

Aurelius Augustine, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De trinitate libri xv*. In W. J. Mountain (editor): *Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina*. T. 50, 1–2, Turnhout, 1968 [= Aug., *De Trin.*]

Aurelius Augustine, *The Trinity*. In J. Rotelle (editor), E. Hill (translator): *The Works of St. Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*. T. 5, New York, 1991 [= Aug., *The Trin..*]

Aurelius Augustine, Maximos Planudes, *Αυγουστίνου περὶ Τριάδος βιβλία πεντεκαίδεκα, ἀπέρ ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετήνεγκε*. In M. Παπαθωμόπουλος, I. Τσαβαρή, G. Rigotti (editors): *Ἀκαδημία Αθηνῶν Βιβλιοθήκη Α. Μανούση*. T. 3, 1–2, Athens, 1995 [= Aug. and Planud, *περὶ Τριάδ.*]

Aurelius Augustine, Prochoros Kydones, *Prochorus Kydones' Übersetzungen von S. Augustinus, De libero arbitrio I 1–90 und Ps.-Augustinus, De decem plagis Aegyptiorum (lateinisch-griechisch)*. In H. Hunger (editor): *Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie und Patristik*. T. 14, Vienna, 1990 [= Aug. and Proch., *De lib. arb.*]

Benedict XII, *Cum Dudum*. In A.L. Täutu, E. Martène (editors): *Codex Iuris Canonici Orientalis. Fontes*. T. 3, Vatican, 1958. Pp. 121–143 [= Ben. XII, *Cum Dudum*]

Nicholas Kabasilas, *Explication de la divine liturgie*. In S. Salaville (editor): *Sources Chrétiennes*. T. 4, b, Paris, 1967 [= Kab., *Explic.*]

Nicholas Kabasilas, *La Vie en Christ*. In Marie-Hélène Congourdeau (editor): *Sources Chrétiennes*. T. 355, Paris, 2009 [= Kab., *De vit. in Christ.*]

Nicholas Kabasilas, *Εἰς τὴν ὑπερένδοξον τῆς ὑπεραγίας δεσποινῆς ὑμῶν Θεοτόκου γέννησιν*. In M. Jugie (editor): *Homélies mariales byzantines. Patrologia Orientalis*. T. 19, 2, Turnhout, 1990. Pp. 41–112 [= Kab., *Sermo in Nat.*]

John Chrysostom, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. In P.E. Pusey (editor): *A Library of the Fathers of the Catholic Church Anterior to the Division of East and West*. T. 5, Oxford, 1840. Pp. 1–98 [= Chrysos., *Comm. ad Galat.*]

Cyril of Alexandria, *Explanatio in Psalmos*. In Jacques Paul Migne (editor): *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*. T. 69, Paris, 1864. Cols. 717–1272 [= Cyr., *Expl. super Psalm.*]

Cyril of Alexandria, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in xii prophetas*. P.E. Pusey (editor). Vol. 2, Oxford, 1868 [= Cyril, *In xii proph.*]

Cyril of Alexandria, *In d. Joannis Evangelium*. In P. Pusey (editor): *Sancti patris nostri Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in d. Joannis Evangelium: Accedunt Fragmenta varia necnon Tractatus ad Tiberium diaconum duo*. T. 3, Oxford, 1872. Pp. 1–171 [= Cyr., *In d. Joann. Evang.*]

Cyril of Alexandria, *Fragmenta in sancti Pauli epistolam ad Romanos*. In P. Pusey (editor): *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium: Accedunt Fragmenta*

varia necnon Tractatus ad Tiberium diaconum duo. T. 3, Oxford, 1872. Pp. 173–248 [= Cyril, *Frag. ad Roman.*]]

John Damascene, *De Fide Orthodoxa: Versions of Bergundio and Cerbanus*, E. Buytaert (editor): Franciscan Institute Publications. Text Series. T. 8, St. Bonaventure 1955 [= Damasc., *De fid. Orth.*]]

John Damascene, *Expositio fidei*. In Bonafatius Kotter (editor): Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos. Patristische Texte und Studien. T. 12, Berlin 1973 [= Damasc., *Expos. fid.*]]

John Damascene, *Contra Nestorianos*. In Bonafatius Kotter (editor): Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos. Patristische Texte und Studien. T. 22, Berlin, 1981. Pp. 263–288 [= Damasc., *Contra Nest.*]]

John Damascene, *Sermo de dormitione beatae virginis Mariae* 2. In Bonifatius Kotter (editor): Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos. Patristische Texte und Studien. T. 29, Berlin, 1988. Pp. 516–540 [= Damasc., *Dorm. II*]]

John Damascene, *In Nativitatem Sanctae Dei Genetricis Mariae*. In Bonifatius Kotter (editor): Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos. Patristische Texte und Studien. T. 29, Berlin 1988. Pp. 169–182 [= Damasc., *In nativ. BMV*]]

John Damascene, *Homilia in nativitatem Domini*. In Bonifatius Kotter (editor): Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos. Patristische Texte und Studien. T. 29, Berlin, 1988. Pp. 324–348 [= Damasc., *In nativ. Dom.*]]

Markos Eugenikos, *Marci Ephesii libellus de consecratione eucharistica*. In L. Petit (editor): *Marci Eugenici Metropolitae Ephesi opera anti-unionistica. Concilium Florentinum Documenta et Scriptores. Series A. T. 10, 1*, Rome 1977. Pp. 118–126 [= Eugen., *Libellus*]]

Markos Eugenikos, *Λόγος Ἀντιρρήτικός Α'*. In M. Pilavakis (editor): *Sfântul Marcu Evhenicul, ὁ ἄγιος Μάρκος ὁ Ἐυγενικός, opera 2, τὰ εὐρισκόμενα ἀπαντά Β'*. T. 2, Bucarest, 2014. Pp. 54–277 [= Eugen., *Λογ. Ἀντιρρό. Α*]]

Fulgentius of Ruspe and Prochoros Kydones, *Πρὸς Πέτρον περὶ πίστεως*. In Anna Koultsiou-Nikita (editor): *Φιλοσοφικὴ καὶ θεολογὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*. T. 40, Thessaloniki, 1999 [= Fulg. and Proch., *Πρὸς Πέτρον*]]

Macarius Makres, *Défense de la virginité*. In A. Argyriou (editor). *Studi e Testi*. T. 314, Vatican, 1986. Pp. 309–326 [= Makr., *Défen. de la Virg.*]]

Maximos Confessor, *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*. In C. Laga, C. Steel (editors): *Corpus Christianorum: Series Graeca*. T. 7, T. 22, Turnhout, 1980–1990 [= Maxim. *Qu. ad Thal.*]]

Gregorios Nazianzen, *In Theophania*. In Jacques Paul Migne (editor): *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*. T. 36, Paris, 1858. Cols. 311–333 [= Naz., *In Theoph.*]]

Gregorios Nazianzen, *De Testamentis et adventu Christi*. In Jacques Paul Migne (editor): *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*. T. 37, Paris, 1862. Cols. 455–462 [= Naz., *De Test. et adv. Christ.*]]

Gregorios Palamas, *Saint Gregory Palamas: The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters (Capita 150)*. In R. Sinkewicz (editor and translator): *Studies and Texts*. T. 83, Toronto, 1988 [= Palam., *CL*]]

Maximos Planudes, *Maximi Monachi Planudis Epistulae*. In P.L.M. Leone (editor): *Classical and Byzantine Monographs*. T. 18, Amsterdam, 1991. Pp. 1–215 [= Planud., *Epist. 121*]]

Sophronios of Jerusalem, *In Sanctissimae Deiparae Annuntiationem*. In Jacques Paul Migne (editor): *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*. T. 87, 3, Paris, 1865. Cols. 3217A–3283B [= Sophr., *Oratio 2: In Sanct. Deipar. Annunt.*]]

Symeon of Thessalonica, *Epistula ad fideles Orientis de pietate*. In D. Balfour (editor): *Ἄγιον Συμεὼν Θεσσαλονίκης 1416/1417–1429 ἔργα θεολογικά. Analecta Vlatadon*. T. 34, Thessalonica, 1981. Pp. 111–137 [= Sym., *Epist. ad fidel.*]]

Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem. R. Weber, R. Gryson (editors). Stuttgart, 2007 [= *Vulg.*]]

Secondary Sources

Argyriou, A. (1986). "Les écrits anti'islamique de Macaire Makrès". In: *Macaire Makrès et la polémique contre l'Islam: édition princeps de l'éloge de Macaire Makrès et de ses deux oeuvres anti'islamiques précédée d'une étude critique*. Ed. by A. Argyriou. Studi e Testi 314. Vatican, pp. 57–94.

Beatrice, P. (2013). *The Transmission of Sin: Augustine and the Pre-Augustinian Sources*. Oxford.

Berger, A. (1953). "Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law". In: *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 43.2.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2001a). "Georges Gennadios Scholarios a-t-il été trois fois patriarche de Constantinople?" In: *Byzantion* 71, pp. 60–72.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2006). "Review of: Christopher Livanos, *Greek tradition and Latin influence in the work of George Scholarios: Alone against all of Europe*". In: *Revue des études byzantines* 64, pp. 395–397.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2008a). *Georges Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400–vers 1472): Un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'Empire byzantine*. Paris.

Boojamra, J. (1976). "Original Sin According to St. Maximus the Confessor". In: *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 20, pp. 19–31.

Buckland, W. (1931). *The Main Institution of Roman Private Law*. New York.

Bucur, B. (2008). "Foreordained from All Eternity: The Mystery of the Incarnation According to Some Early Christian and Byzantine Writers". In: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 62, pp. 199–215.

Bulgakov, S. (1988). *The Orthodox Church*. London.

Candal, M. (1965). "La Virgen Santísima 'prepurificada' en su Anunciación". In: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 31, pp. 241–276.

Cavadini, J. and M. Djuth (1999). *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*. Grand Rapids.

Chiettini, E. (1955). "La prima sanctificatione di Maria Ss.ma nella scuola francescana del sec. xiii". In: *Virgo immaculata: Acta Congressus mariologici-mariani Romae anno MCMLIV celebrati*. Ed. by C. Balić. Vol. 4. Rome, pp. 1–39.

Congourdeau, M.-H. (2004). "Nicholas Cabasilas et le Palamisme". In: *Gregorio Palamas e otre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*. Ed. by A. Rigo. Orientalia Venetiana, 16. Florence, pp. 191–210.

Congourdeau, M.-H. (2007). *L'embryon et son âme dans les sources grecques (vie siècle av. J.-C.-ve siècle apr. J.-C.)* Collège de France –Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance. Monographies, 26. Paris.

Congourdeau, M.-H. (2009). "Nikolas Kabasilas et la théologie latine". In: *Byzantine Theologians: The Systematization of their own Doctrine and their Perception of foreign Doctrines*. Ed. by A. Rigo and P. Ermilov. Quaderni, 3. Roma, pp. 169–179.

Dekkers, E. (1953). "Les traductions grecques des écrits patristiques latins". In: *Sacris Erudiri* 5, pp. 193–233.

Demacopoulos, G. and A. Papanikolaou (2008). "Augustine and the Orthodox: 'The West' in the East". In: *Orthodox Readings of Augustine*. Ed. by G. Demacopoulos and A. Papanikolaou. Crestwood, NY, pp. 11–40.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (1997). *Αύγουστινος καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς: Τὰ προβλήματα τῶν ἀριστοτελικῶν κατηγοριῶν καὶ τῆς τριαδικῆς ψυχοθεολογίας*. Athens.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (1998). "Nicholas Cabasilas' Quaestio de Rationis Valore: An Anti-Palamite Defense of Secular Wisdom". In: *Byzantina* 19, pp. 53–93.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (1999). *Νικολάου Καβασιλά κατά Πύρρωνο: Πλατωνικός φιλοσοφηπτικισμός καὶ ἀριστοτελικός ἀντισκεπτικισμός*. Athens.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2010e). "Échos d'Orient -- Résonances d'Ouest. In Respect of: C.G. Conticello – V. Conticello, ed., *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition. II: XIIIe-XIXe S.*" In: *Nicolaus* 37, pp. 67–148.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2011b). "Palamas Transformed: Palamite Interpretations of the Distinction between God's 'Essence' and 'Energies' in Late Byzantium". In: *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*. Ed. by M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel. Bibliotheca, 11. Leuven, Paris, and Walpole, pp. 263–272.

Dunn, G. (2006). "Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria, and the Pelagian Controversy". In: *Augustine Studies* 37, pp. 63–88.

Dvornik, F. (1958). "The Byzantine Church and the Immaculate Conception". In: *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: History and Significance*. Ed. by E. O'Conner. Notre Dame, pp. 87–112.

Eldarov, G. (1955). "La dottrina dell'immacolata nei maestri francescani e nei teologi palamiti dei secoli XIV–XV". In: *Virgo immaculata: Acta Congressus mariologici-mariani Romae anno MCMLIV celebrati*. Ed. by C. Balic. Vol. 4. Rome, pp. 185–195.

Evdokimov, P. (1979). *Orthodoxy*. London.

Fehlner, P. D. (2007). "The Predestination of the Virgin Mother and Her Immaculate Conception". In: *Mariology: A Guide for Priests, Deacons, Seminarians, and Consecrated Persons*. Ed. by M. Miravalle. Goleta, pp. 213–276.

Flogaus, R. (1996b). "Der heimliche Blick nach Westen: Zur Rezeption von Augustinus *De Trinitate* durch Gregorios Palamas". In: *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 46, pp. 275–297.

Flogaus, R. (1997b). *Theosis bei Palamas und Luther ein Beitrag zum ökumenischen Gespräch*. Forschungen zur systematischen und ökumenischen Theologie, 78. Göttingen.

Florovsky, G. (1976). "Cur Deus Homo?" In: *The Motive for the Incarnation. Collected Works of George Florovsky*. Vol. 3. Belmont, pp. 163–170.

Gill, J. (1959). *The Council of Florence*. Cambridge.

Gillet, L. (1983). "The Immaculate Conception and the Orthodox Church". In: *Chrysostom* 6, pp. 151–159.

Gordillo, M. (1954). *Mariologia orientalis*. Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 141. Rome.

Green, B. (2008). *The Soteriology of Leo the Great*. Oxford.

Jones, D. A. (2012). "Thomas Aquinas, Augustine, and Aristotle on 'Delayed Animation'". In: *The Thomist* 76, pp. 1–36.

Jugie, M. (1914). "Georges Scholarios et l'Immaculée Conception". In: *Échoes d'Orient* 17, pp. 527–530.

Jugie, M. (1922). "Homélie sur la Dormition de la Sainte Vierge". In: *Patrologia Orientalis* 16, pp. 567–570.

Jugie, M. (1923–1935). *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum orientalium ab ecclesia catholica dissidentium*. 5 vols. Paris.

Jugie, M. (1937). "L'unionisme de Georges Scholarios". In: *Échoes d'Orient* 36, pp. 65–86.

Jugie, M. (1952). *L'Immaculée Conception dans l'Écriture sainte et dans la tradition orientale: étude historico-doctrinale*. Rome.

Kappes, C. W. (2013b). "The Latin Sources of the Palamite Theology of George-Gennadius Scholarius". In: *Nicolaus* 40, pp. 74–114.

Kappes, C. W. (2014b). "A Latin Defense of Mark of Ephesus at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439)". In: *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 49, pp. 159–230.

Kappes, C. W. (2014c). *The Immaculate Conception: Why Thomas Aquinas Denied, While John Duns Scotus, Gregory Palamas, and Mark Eugenicus Professed the Absolute Immaculate Existence of Mary*. New Bedford.

Koltsiou-Nikita, A. (1999). "Introduction". In: *Φουλγεντίου Πρόδη Πέτρον περὶ πίστεως*. Ed. by A. Koltsiou-Nikita. Φιλοσοφική καὶ θεολογικὴ βιβλιοθήκη, 40. Thessaloniki, pp. 11–49.

Larchet, J.-C. (2011). *Saint Maxime le Confesseur (580–662)*. Paris.

Laurent, V. (1953). "L'Oeuvre scientifique du R. P. Martin Jugie". In: *Mélanges Martin Jugie, Institut Français D'Études Byzantines*. Paris, pp. 7–32.

Likoudis, J. (2007). "The Mariology of Gregory Palamas". In: *Marian Coredeemption in the Eucharistic Mystery*. Ed. by P. Fehlner. Vol. 6 (Mary at the Foot of the Cross). New Bedford, pp. 139–158.

Livanos, C. (2006a). *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios: "Alone against all Europe"*. Piscataway.

Lossky, V. (1974c). *In the Image and Likeness of God*. Crestwood.

Lossky, V. (1976). *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Crestwood.

Lossky, V. (1978). *Orthodox Theology: an Introduction*. Crestwood.

Lössl, J. (2000). "Augustine in Byzantium". In: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51, pp. 267–295.

Louth, A. (2013). "The reception of Augustine in Late Byzantium". In: *Nicolaus 40*, pp. 115–123.

Lyonnet, S. (1961). *Le péché originel en Rom 5, 12 et le Concile de Trente*. Rome.

Manoussakis, J. (2015). *For the Unity of All: Contributions to the Theological Dialogue between East and West*. Eugene, OR.

McKenna, J. (2009). *The Eucharistic Epiclesis: A Detailed History from the Patristic to the Modern Era*. Chicago.

Mercati, G. (1931c). *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo xiv*. Vatican City.

Meyendorff, J. (1974a). *A Study of Gregory Palamas*. Crestwood.

Meyendorff, J. (1974b). *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctoral Themes*. Fordham.

Meyendorff, J. (1983). *Catholicity and the Church*. Crestwood.

Nichols, A. (2005). *Wisdom from Above: A Primer in the Theology of Father Sergei Bulgakov*. Leominster.

Nichols, A. (2015). *There Is No Rose: The Mariology of the Catholic Church*. Minneapolis.

Papadopoulos, S. G. (1967e). *Oἱ Ἑλληνικαὶ μεταφράσεις θωμιστικῶν ἔργων: φιλοθωμιστὰ καὶ ἀντιθωμιστὰ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ, συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ιστορίαν τῆς βυζαντινῆς θεολογίας*. Athens.

Plested, M. (2012c). *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*. Oxford.

Romanides, J. (2001). *Tὸ προπατορικὸν ἀμάρτημα*. Athens.

Schmemann, A. (1966). *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*. Crestwood.

Sherwood, P. (1962). "Byzantine Mariology". In: *Eastern Churches Quarterly* 8, pp. 384–409.

Spiteris, Y. (1996). "La mariologia di Gregorio Palamas". In: *Lateranum*, pp. 551–584.

Tinnefeld, F. (2002e). "Georgios Gennadios Scholarios". In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*. Ed. by C. Conticello and V. Conticello. Vol. 2. Turnhout, pp. 493–533.

Toniolo, E. M. (2008). "Giorgio (Gennadio) Scholarios (†1472)". In: *Testi mariani del secondo millennio: 1. Autori orientali (secc. xi–xx)*. Ed. by G. Gharib and E. Toniolo. Rome, pp. 565–578.

Trizio, M. (2006). "Un uomo sapiente ed apostolico": Agostino a Bisanzio: Gregorio Palamas lettore del 'De trinitate'. In: *Quaestio 6*, pp. 131–189.

Turner, C. J. G. (1967). "George-Gennadius Scholarios and the Union of Florence". In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 18, pp. 83–103.

Van Oort, J. (1989). "Augustine on Sexual Concupiscence and Original Sin". In: *Studia Patristica* 22, pp. 382–386.

Van Loon, H. (2013). "The Pelagian Debate and Cyril of Alexandria's Theology". In: *Studia Patristica* 68, pp. 61–84.

Wright, C. (2013c). "Towards an Edition of Demetrius Kydones's Autograph Translation of Thomas Aquinas's 'Summa Theologiae: Prima Pars'". In: *Nicolaus 40*, pp. 15–30.

Yannaras, C. (2006). *Ορθοδοξία καὶ Δύση στὴ Νεώτερη Ἑλλάδα*. Athens.

Zezes, T. (1988). *Γεννάδιος Β΄ Σχολάριος: Βίος -- Συγγράμματα -- Διδασκαλία*. Άναλεκτα Βλατάδων, 30. Thessaloniki.

Michail Konstantinou-Rizos

Prochoros Cydones' Translation of Thomas Aquinas' *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia* and *Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*

Method and Purpose

Unlike Demetrios Cydones, whose life and work is well documented and has been extensively studied,¹ not much is known about his brother Prochoros' life.² Most of our information comes from Demetrios' Letters and the Synodal Tome of 1368 that condemned him. Demetrios' younger brother by almost eleven years, Prochoros, was born c. 1333/4. Sharing his brother's intellectual interests and spiritual pursuits, he traveled to Mount Athos sometime after 1350. There he was tonsured and later ordained priest, before he was elected abbot of the Great Lavra. We do not know in what way he learned Latin, though it is possible that he was taught by his brother, who had learnt the language from a Dominican friar in Pera, probably Philippo de Bindo Incontris.³ His admiration for Latin scholastic thought and his expressed anti-Palamite theological convictions proved incompatible with his position within the strongly pro-Palamite community on Mount Athos.

Soon, his anti-Palamite convictions reached the ears of the Patriarch Philotheos. In 1366, some of Prochoros' fellow monks complained about his attitude. A year later, on the first Sunday of Lent in 1367, although Prochoros was required to read out and sign at the synaxis the Synodal Tome of the Council the hesychasts had held the previous year, he continued expressing his hostility against Palamas' teachings. His cell was subsequently searched and Prochoros was found to possess "heretical books". On this pretext, he was expelled by his superior, Jacob Trikanas. His condemnation led his brother Demetrios to go public against the Palamite version of hesychasm, officially sanctioned by the Byzantine Church (1341; 1351; 1368), as is evident in some of his letters. Prochoros himself wrote a letter to Philotheos in the early summer of 1367, complaining about the dishonourable defamation (*συκοφαντία*) and injustice (*ἀδικία*)

¹ For a comprehensive bibliography on Demetrios, see Ryder 2010.

² See Trapp et al. 1990, no. 13883. See also Mercati 1931a; Tyn 1964, 837–912; Podskalsky 1977b, 207–209; Tinnefeld 1981, 237–244; Russell 2006, 75–91; Plested 2012a, 73–84; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2015, 582–583; J. A. Demetracopoulos n.d.(c).

³ J. A. Demetracopoulos 2010a, 834–835.

against him.⁴ He also sent his refutations of Palamism, including his work *De Essentia et operatione*,⁵ inviting the Patriarch to read and judge for himself. The reason for composing these works, he said, was to vindicate “the great mystery of theology” (τὸ μέγα τῆς θεολογίας μυστήριον), which God wished to keep partly inaccessible to man and which was disreputed by the “novel inventors of doctrine” (νέοι δογματισταί), implying Palamas and his followers. Those “novel inventors” thought they could describe the divine being by dividing it into two or three levels, namely essence, potency, and energies; they even claimed that man could reach deification in this life.

The teachings of Gregory Palamas (c. 1296–1357), known as the Palamite theology or Palamism, had been rejected by the Western Christianity and divided the Byzantines. In his refutations of Palamism, Prochoros adopted the scholastic method (presumably taught by his brother) and was – rather unfairly – accused of subjecting patristic texts to syllogistic reasoning, contrary to the usual method of interpretation employed by orthodox theologians (τῆς ἡμῶν ἐξηγήσεως), clearly aiming to oppose it.⁶ Differentiating between the terms *energy* and *energetic* (ἐνέργεια and ἐνέργητικόν) and between *action* and *acting* (ἐνέργημα and ἐνέργοῦν), in this following John Damascene, Prochoros attempted to show in his works, according to the Synodal Tome of 1368, not only that God is pure essence without natural and essential energy as really distinct from his essence, but also that it is impossible for man to participate in the divinity, which goes counter to the Palamite doctrine of man’s deification *in statu viae*.⁷

As far as we know, Prochoros composed a limited number of works,⁸ namely a treatise *On the divine names and the apophatic and cataphatic theology*⁹ (refuting Palamas’ theory that the names of God refer solely to His energies), and a treatise *De essentia et operatione Dei* (*Περὶ οὐσίας καὶ ἐνέργειας*). His major contributions were his translations of Latin patristic and theological works, including Augustine’s *De beata*

4 *Synodal Tome of 1368*, l. 604–605, in: Rigo 2004, 121 (=PG 151: cols. 696B-C).

5 This work has been inadequately edited by J. Filovski and M. D. Petruševski, “Γρηγορίου τοῦ Ακινδύνου Πραγματεία εἰς τὸ περὶ οὐσίας καὶ ἐνέργειας ζήτημα”, in: *Živa antika* 23 (1973) 33–67 and 317–367; 24 (1974), 295–331; 26 (1976), 161–192 and 487–499. For Books I and II, see also PG 151, cols. 1191–1242; for book VI, see also Candal 1954, 247–296. The work, erroneously attributed to Gregory Akinindynos, is in fact Prochoros Cydones’. A new critical edition of the complete text is being prepared by Ch. Triabtafyllopoulos and V. Pasiourtides (See <https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/Hellenic-Institute/Research/Thomas.html>). For the treatise’s impact, see: Triantafyllopoulos 2012, 411–429. See also Voordeckers and Tinnefeld 1987.

6 *Synodal Tome of 1368*, l., in: Rigo 2004, 106 (=PG 151, col. 698B-C).

7 *Synodal Tome of 1368*, l., in: Rigo 2004, 106 (=PG 151, col. 698D).

8 See Plested 2012a, 77–80.

9 Edited in Polemis 2012.

vita (I 4-II 9),¹⁰ *De vera religione* (I 1-VIII 15),¹¹ eight *Letters*;¹² *De libero arbitrio* (up to I, 90),¹³ Ps.-Augustine, *De decem plagis Aegyptiorum*;¹⁴ Hervaeus Natalis, *Sententiae*, Lib. I, dist. I, qq. 1–4 and 7;¹⁵ Boethius, *De topicis differentiis* (as far as ‘ἐν οἷς...’ II, 11.8),¹⁶ and more importantly Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*, Pars IIIa, qq. 45, 49, 54–55; *Supplementum*, 76 qq., *De aeternitate mundi*, proem to the *Commentary* on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, and the *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia* (*QDP*)¹⁷ and *Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis* (*QDSC*).¹⁸ It is Prochoros' translations of these two *Questiones* that I have edited in an attempt to further explore the transmission and impact of Latin philosophical and theological texts in Byzantium in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as part of the international research project *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus*.¹⁹

The answer to the question why Prochoros chose to translate these two *Quaestiones* can be found in their content. *QDSC* examines the nature of spiritual creatures focusing on God and the angels, while *QDP* investigates the power of God; whether there is power in Him and if it is infinite and generative, if He is omnipotent and almighty, and generally themes related to the nature of the divine essence and power. *De potentia* also refers to the Filioque. Both works explore the question whether the essence of spiritual beings, including God, is identical with their and power/activity, which was at the heart of the Palamite controversy.

One of the main aims of my study is to explore the method and technique Prochoros used in rendering the original Latin text of the two *Questiones* into Greek in an attempt to assess the metaphrastic process. For this purpose, specimens of the two texts are examined in parallel below, by means of a philological commentary (including a lexical and stylistic analysis) based on a collation of Prochoros' Greek translations with the Latin original texts in the Leonina and Taurini editions. It should be

10 Unedited.

11 Edited in Lössl 2007.

12 Edited in Hunger 1990b.

13 Edited in Hunger 1990b, 12–53.

14 Hunger 1990b, 54–69.

15 An edition is prepared by Chr. Kappes (See <https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/Hellenic-Institute/Research/Thomas.html>).

16 Nikitas 1990.

17 See Thomas Aquinas, *Sancti Thomae De Aquino, Opera Omnia. Iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita cura et studio fratrum praedicatorum, Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*, ed. J. Cos, t. 24, 2, Rome/Paris, 2000.

18 See Thomas Aquinas, *S. Thomae Aquinatis doctoris angelici, Quaestiones disputatae*, ed. P. M. Pession, t. 2, *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia* (10th edition: Marietti), Taurini/Romae, 1965, 1–276.

19 For information on this project, co-hosted by the University of Patras and RHUL Hellenic Institute, see <https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/Hellenic-Institute/Research/Thomas.htm>. My research for the edition of Prochoros Cydones' *QDP* and *QDSC* is funded by the Foundation for Education and European Culture (IPEP) and the RHUL Hellenic institute.

stressed that during our collation of the Greek and Latin *Quaestiones*, it became clear that Prochoros must have used a different tradition of the Latin texts, as indicated by a large number of variants as well as passages in the Greek text that do not correspond to the edited Latin text.

In his translation of *QDP* and *QDSC* Prochoros retained, by and large, the structure and word order of the Latin text, so long as it agreed with the syntax of his target language. Nevertheless, he was prepared to adapt the text when necessary in order to keep the meaning of the Latin words and at the same time to make the Greek version natural and comprehensible for the reader, who would read it independently, rather than using it as a guide to the Latin original. Hence he often uses *periphrasis* in his translation to provide a more varied, stylish and natural rendering in Greek, e.g., in *QDP*, “est formatum” has been translated as “εἰς εἴδος ἥλθεν” (*QDP* 4, 1, 15.100], “perspicacitas” as “τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων διορατικόν” (*QDP* 13, 17, 32, l. 180), “est” as “ἐστήρικται” (*QDP* 5, 8, 11, l. 91) and “impedit” as “έμποδῶν γίνεται” (*QDP* 1, 3, 23, l. 168). Similarly, in *QDSC*, “τοῦ σώματος” for “corporalem” (*QDSC* 9, 30, l. 361) and “τὰ εἰς κόσμον τελοῦντα” for “ornamenta” (*QDSC* 8, 33, l. 341); also “necessarium (est)” becomes “ἀναγκαῖον τυγχάνει” (*QDSC* 4, 6, ll. 32–34), while throughout the text “Commentator” translates as “Υπόμνημα”, which is more common in Greek.

On the other hand, Prochoros often accurately renders phrases of Aquinas’ text in a more concise manner; for example, he translates “quod est commune” as “τοῦ κοινοῦ” (*QDSC* 11, 6, 39), “ea ratione” as “οὕτω” (*QDSC* 11, 27, 221) and “de naturis rerum sensibilium” as “τῶν νοητῶν πραγμάτων” (*QDSC* 9, 21, 155). There is an instance where he abridges even a whole section:

Aquinas <i>QDSC</i> a. 1 ad 9	Prochoros’ translation 1, 45, ll. 401–404
Non enim ex hoc contingit quod aliquod individuum sit corpus inanimatum et aliud corpus animatum per hoc quod individuum animatum habet formam aliquam, cui substernatur forma substantialis corporis; sed quia hoc individuum animatum habet formam perfectiorem, per quam habet non solum subsistere et corpus esse, sed etiam uiuere; aliud autem habet formam imperfectiorem, per quam non attingit ad uitam, sed solum ad subsistere corporaliter.	Άλλ' ὅτι τοδὶ μὲν ἔμψυχον ἄτομον ἔχει τε δεύτερον εἶδος, δι' οὗ ἔχει οὐ μόνον τὸ ὑφεστάναι καὶ σῶμα εἶναι, ἀλλὰ πρὸς δὲ καὶ τὸ ζῆν, τὸ ἔτερον δὲ ἔχει εἶδος ἀτελέστερον, δι' οὗ οὐκ ἐφικνεῖται πρὸς τὴν ζωήν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ ὑφεστάναι μόνον σωματικῶς.

These abridgments, or more concise renderings of phrases, if not due to defects of the Latin manuscript used by Prochoros, serve a practical purpose, that is, to avoid repetition and obfuscating the meaning.

This tendency of avoiding repetition on aesthetic grounds is also evident from instances where a certain noun is repeated in a section of the Latin text. Prochoros replaces the noun in question with the definite pronoun *αὐτός* in oblique cases, e.g.: “Τῷ αὐτῷ δὲ λόγῳ τὸ σῶμα (corpus) διοικεῖ, ὃ καὶ ἐνοῦται· οἰχομένων γὰρ τῶν οὓς αὐτὸ (corpus) διοικεῖ ἀπαλλάττεται ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ (corpore)” (QDSC 3, 7, ll. 53–54); also “τῆς λογικῆς ψυχῆς (anima rationalis) ... Παραδομένης τοίνυν αὐτῆς (anima rationali)” (QDSC 3, 12, ll. 74–75). In QDP (3, 5, l. 1.5) the “posterores philosophi” are rendered as “ἐπιγενόμενοι φιλόσοφοι” (l. 36) and later in the same paragraph as “ὕστατον φιλοσοφήσαντες” (l. 44). Throughout Prochoros' translation it is clear that he likes to vary his vocabulary. In QDP (3, 18, l. 23) he translates “(corpora) propinquā” as “(σώματα) τὰ ἔκποδῶν αὐτῷ” and in the same paragraph he renders “(creaturas angelicas) sibi propinquas” as “τοὺς ἀγγειλικοὺς διακόσμους τοὺς παρ’ αὐτήν”. In other cases he omits repeating the noun in question when not necessary, as shown in the following sections:

Aquinas, q. 3 a. 6 co.	QDP 3, 6, 30, l. 173
Et vetus Testamentum, quod respectu novi Testamenti	καὶ τὴν Παλαιὰν Διαθήκην, πρὸς τὴν Νέαν
Aquinas, q. 3 a. 9 sol. 9	QDP 3, 9, 39, ll. 321–322
In genere substantiae, sicut est in genere qualitatis	τῆς οὐσίας γένει, ἢ δὴ κάν τῷ τῆς ποιότητος

Another characteristic of Prochoros' translation is that he uses the same translation for a number of similar terms, e.g. “σκέψις” for “inquisitio” (QDSC 1, 36, l. 207) and “consideratio” (QDSC 8, 23, l. 238); “μεταβολή” for “mutabilitas” (QDSC 1, 3, l. 16), “transmutatio” (QDSC 3, 28, l. 266) and “conversio” (QDSC 3, 19, l. 117).²⁰ On the other hand, he often gives more than one translation for a single word or term, e.g. “πλείω” (QDSC 3, 28, l. 280), “περαιτέρω” (QDSC 3, 28, l. 296), “πλέον” (QDSC 6, 41, l. 280), “μᾶλλον” (QDSC 9, 21, l. 226) for “amplius”. In the case of “ὑπερτάτη (QDSC 8, 21, l. 219), ἀνωτάτη (QDSC 8, 21, l. 193) and χθαμαλωτέρα (QDSC 8, 32, l. 335) μοῖρα” for “suprema pars”, the latter has the opposite meaning, which points rather to a different word in the Latin MS Prochoros consulted. The same applies for “διάνοια” (QDSC 10, 29, l. 367), “ζωή” (QDSC 1, 17, l. 52) and “μνήμη” (QDSC 11, 1, l. 6) for “mens”.

²⁰ See lists of Prochoros' translation of terms in Hunger 1984a, 4–92; cf. review by Nicol 1985.

More importantly, Prochoros' translation alters the meaning of certain words, e.g. “μόρφωσις” (*QDSC* 2, 22, l. 161) for “forma” (unless he was reading “formatio”), while his interpretation of certain words sometimes departs from the original meaning, without however disrupting the understanding of the context, e.g. his translation of “Ergo cum in parte non inveniatur figura totius ...” as “Ἐπεὶ τοιγαροῦν τὰ μέρη οὐ μιμεῖται τὸ τοῦ ὄλου σχῆμα ...” (*QDSC* 4, 8, ll. 49–50) – unless, again, Prochoros was reading a different word, e.g. “imitetur” instead of “inveniatur”.

Finally, Prochoros tends to exaggerate certain Latin words by choosing stronger words in his translation, especially using the superlative degree of comparison in rendering Latin adverbs and adjectives into Greek. For example, in *QDP*, he uses “κατάδηλόν ἔστιν” for “patet” (*QDP* 3, 6, l. 30), “ὄνησιμωτάτη” for “utilis” (*QDP* 5, 6, 17, l. 151), “σκοπημότατον” for “intentus” (*QDP* 3, 15, 23, l. 133), and “τὸ αἰσχος” for “informitas” (*QDP* 4, 1, 2, l. 14). In *QDSC*, “μάλιστα” for “magis” (*QDSC* 9, 31, l. 378), “ἐρρωμενότατα” (*QDSC* 2, 23, l. 180) for “efficacius” and “ἡλθιώτατον” for “absurdum” (*QDSC* 7, 7, l. 48).

From the aforementioned examples it is evident that Prochoros' main aim was to convey the meaning of the *sententiae* to the Greek reader in a clear and elegant style, sometimes maybe at the expense of consistency in his translation of terms, as indeed his brother Demetrios did.²¹

Nevertheless, in other cases these divergences, rather than reflecting Prochoros' comprehension of the Latin text or his ability to render it in Greek, are most likely a result of errors of the scribe/s, namely misreadings, misunderstandings, misspellings, omissions and *homoioteleuta* (eyeskips). For example, errors such as “δὴ” instead of “δεῖ” (*QDSC* 1, 1, l. 6), “ἢ” instead of “εἰ” (*QDSC* 1, 10, l. 60) and “ἢτις” instead of “εἴ τις” (*QDSC* 1, 36, l. 240) are due to *itacism* and/or the resemblance of the majuscule **H** with the diphthong ει. Similar confusion leading to misspellings is caused by the homophones *omicron* and *omega* (*isochronism*), so we often find “αύτῷ” instead of “αύτό” (*QDSC* 9, 20, l. 138), “ὅ” instead of “ῷ” (*QDSC* 10, 19, l. 135) and “τῶν” instead of “τόν” (*QDSC* 1, 11, l. 95). Responsible for such errors, including accentuation, can also be the copyist's personal literacy and comprehension – or lack thereof – of the text he had in front of him, which may have led him to either reproduce an error by copying it or introduce a new one. For example, the erroneous “ὑφεστῶς” for “ὑφεστώς” in our codex appears consistently throughout the text.

In the wider category of scribal errors, we may include oddities in the Greek translation, possibly a result of errors and/or omissions in the Latin MSS that Prochoros was reading. A good example is the use of “ἡ πρώτη ὕλη” in the nominative instead of the expected syntax, “ἀπὸ πρώτης ὕλης” (“a prima materia”) (*QDSC* 1, 21, l. 149); it is possible that Prochoros was reading “prima materia” without the preposition “a” and therefore misunderstood it as nominative.

²¹ On Demetrios' translating method see now Wright 2013b, 19–30; Also Kalamakis 1996, 40–51.

Certain syntactical errors or oddities in the Greek translation may be attributed to Prochoros himself, e. g. “τῇ ἔαυτοῦ ἐνώσει” instead of “τῇ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἐνώσει” (“per huiusmodi unionem”) (*QDSC* 3, 11, l. 67). In some cases, Prochoros is clearly influenced by the Latin syntax, e. g. “τῶν μετεχόντων αὐτὸ τὸ φῶς” for “quae participant ipsum lumen”, where the accusative *lumen* misleads him to place τὸ φῶς in the accusative, instead of genitive (*QDSC* 10, 25, l. 318); also “εἴδος ... ἥτις ἐστί”, where he qualifies the neuter εἴδος with the feminine pronoun ἥτις, having the feminine “forma” in mind; the same with “ώστ’ εἶναι δύο ψυχαῖ” (instead of ψυχάς) for “quod sint duae animae”. Another interesting example is Prochoros’ translation of “ad unum totum constituendum” as “πρὸς ἐν ὅλον ποιητέον”, where, influenced by the Latin gerundive attraction, he uses *πρὸς + verbal adjective* instead of a final clause to express purpose.²²

At this point it should be stressed that the Leonine edition of *QDSC* rarely records variants of words that would help us identify MSS, or families of MSS, which might transmit the text Prochoros had at his disposal. As for *QDP*, the Taurini edition lacks an *apparatus criticus* altogether. Some peculiarities in the translation indicate that Prochoros was reading a different word than the one in the edited Latin text. For example, in *QDSC*, the translation of “necessitatis” as “εὐγενείας” (*QDSC* 6, 21, l. 146) suggests that Prochoros was reading a different word (in this case perhaps “nobilitatis”); the same applies for the translation of “vacuum” as “ὄρνιθων” (from “avium”?) (*QDSC* 7, 3, l. 18), and “agentem” as “vooῦντα” (from “intelligentem”?) (*QDSC* 9, 21, l. 161). Similarly, in *QDP* we observe Prochoros’ translation of “sive” as “ώσπερ”, which suggests that Prochoros was probably reading “sicut” (*QDP* 2, 3, 10, l. 63). From his translation “ἡ ψυχὴ πρὸ τοῦ δημιουργηθῆναι τὸ σῶμα” for “anima antequam corpori uniatur” (*QDP* 3, 10, 7, l. 45) we assume that Prochoros was translating the word “creatur” instead of “uniatur”.

Furthermore, there are instances where the Greek translation makes more sense than the Latin edited text. In “Τινὲς γὰρ ἀρχαῖοι φιλόσοφοι μὴ τιθέμενοι ἄλλην ὁδὸν καταλήψεως παρὰ τὴν αἰσθησιν” for “quidam antiqui philosophi, non ponentes aliam vim cognoscitivam praeter sensum” (*QDSC* 10, 28, l. 353) we see that Prochoros was translating the appropriate word “viam” (recorded most likely in his MS/S) instead of the “vim” recorded in the Leonine edition. Prochoros’ translation of such variants may help the editors of Aquinas’ works reconstruct the Latin text and possibly improve the modern editions. In *QDP*, the incomprehensible phrase “Deus praedestinavit Petrum quia voluit” in the Taurini edition makes sense when we read Prochoros’ translation “ὁ Θεὸς προώρισε τὴν ἀμαρτίαν”, which indicates that he was reading a different word, most likely “peccatum”:

²² This is also attested in Demetrios Cydones’ translations: see J. A. Demetracopoulos 2002b, 117–171; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2007a, 301–376.

Aquinas <i>QDP</i> q. II a. 3 arg. 4	Prochoros <i>QDP</i> 2, 3, 4
Sed contra, praedestinatio quodammodo est actus intellectus: dicimus enim, quod Deus praedestinavit Petrum quia voluit, secundum illud Rom. IX, 18: cuius vult miseretur et quem vult indurat. Ergo non solum in humanis sed etiam in divinis voluntas imperat actum intellectus.	ό γὰρ προορισμὸς τρόπῳ γέ τῷ, ἐνέργεια ἔστὶ τοῦ νοῦ. Φαμὲν δὲ ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς προώρισε τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, ὅτι ἡθέλησε, κατ' ἕκεῖνο τῆς Πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐν τῷ ἐνάτῳ· ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ, ὃν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει. Οὐκ ὅρα ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρωπείοις μόνον, ἀλλὰ κανὸς θείοις ἡ θέλησις ἐπιτάπει ταῖς τοῦ νοῦ ἐνεργείαις.

This observation is strengthened by the following examples: Prochoros translates “...οὐκ ἀνάγκη ἐκ τῆς ἐπινοίας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἢ [intentione] τοῦ εἰδούς εἶναι τὸ νοεῖσθαι παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἢ ἄλλου” (*QDSC* 9, 34, l. 401–2) for “...non oportet quod de intellectu hominis aut intentionis speciei sit quod intelligatur a me uel ab illo”. The last word, “ἄλλου”, should have been “alio” (by someone else) in the Latin edited text, if supported by a witness, as it seems more correct than the “illo” (by him/that one) adopted in the Leonine edition; “alio” is simply not recorded by the editor in the *apparatus criticus*. Also, Prochoros translates “per cor mouet alia membra, et per spiritum etiam mouet corpus” as “διὸ μὲν τῆς καρδίας κινεῖν τὰ ἄλλα μέλη, διὰ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος, κινεῖ τὴν καρδίαν” (*QDSC* 3, 28, l. 178–9). The word “corpus” could be an erroneous variant of “cor”.

It is evident, therefore, that Prochoros’ translations of *QDP* and *QDSC* are essential in identifying and restoring problematic parts in the modern Latin editions, and at the same time shed light on the transmission of the Latin text, thus proving instrumental for future editors of Aquinas’ two works. The same applies more generally for the future editions of Latin Thomistic works that have been translated into Greek. Given that modern editions are inevitably based on a limited number of surviving codices so far discovered and catalogued, there may be similar instances where the Greek translation is more comprehensible than the Latin text, which may be based on erroneous variants.

Concerning the rendering of passages from classical Greek authors, although Prochoros probably had access to Greek editions of classical texts, he evidently did not quote the Greek text *verbatim*. For instance, in Aquinas’ quotations of Greek authors

Prochoros follows faithfully the Latin translation without changing or enriching it on the basis of the Greek original. This is illustrated below:

Aquinas QDSC: a. 3 resp. ²⁴	Prochoros QDSC: 3, 28	Aristotle, <i>De an.</i> II, 414b28–32
Vnde etiam Aristotiles in II <i>De anima</i> dicit quod “uegetarium est in sensitivo” et sensituum in intellectivo “sicut trigonum in tetragono” et tetragonum in pentagono: pentagonum enim uirtute continet tetragonum.	Ὄθεν καὶ ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῷ Περὶ ψυχῆς δευτέρῳ φησί· τὸ φυτικὸν εἶναι ἔστιν ἐν τῷ αἰσθητικῷ καὶ τὸ αἰσθητικὸν ἐν τῷ νοερῷ, ὥσπερ τὸ τρίγωνον ἐν τῷ τετραγώνῳ καὶ τὸ τετράγωνον ἐν τῷ πεντάγωνῳ· τὸ γὰρ πεντάγωνον δυνάμει περιέχει τὸ τετράγωνον.	Παραπλησίως δ’ ἔχει τῷ περὶ τῶν σχημάτων καὶ τὰ κατὰ ψυχήν· ἀεὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἐφεξῆς ὑπάρχει δυνάμει τὸ πρότερον ἐπί τε τῶν σχημάτων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐμψύχων, οἷον ἐν τετραγώνῳ μὲν τρίγωνον, ἐν αἰσθητικῷ δὲ τὸ θρεπτικόν.

It is clear that in this case Prochoros translates the Latin *verbum e verbo* without quoting the original Greek text.

Prochoros faithfully reproduces in his translation Aquinas' erroneous references to Greek authors, as to Aristotle's *Physics* and *Metaphysics* below:

Aquinas QDSC: a. 4 arg. 10 ²⁶	Prochoros QDSC: 4, 9	Aristotle, <i>Phys.</i> VIII, 267b6–9
...ut patet per Philosophum in IV <i>Physicorum</i> , ubi dicit quod motor celi non est in centro sed in quadam parte circumferentie. Multo minus igitur anima est in qualibet parte sui corporis.	...ώς φαίνεται διὰ τοῦ Φιλοσόφου ἐν τῷ τῆς Φυσικῆς τετάρτῳ, ἔνθα φησὶ τὸν κινοῦντα τὸν οὐρανὸν μὴ εἶναι ἐν τῷ κέντρῳ, ἀλλ’ ἐν τινι μέρει τῆς περιφερείας. Πολλῷ ἀρά ἡττον ἡ ψυχὴ ἔστιν ἐν ὅτινιοῦν μέρει τοῦ σώματος.	ἀνάγκη δὴ ἡ ἐν μέσῳ ἡ ἐν κύκλῳ εἶναι· αὗται γὰρ αἱ ἀρχαί, ἀλλὰ τάχιστα κινεῖται τὰ ἐγγύτατα τοῦ κινοῦντος. τοιαύτη δ’ ἡ τοῦ κύκλου κίνησις· ἐκεῖ ἀρά τὸ κινοῦν.
Aquinas QDSC: a. 4 arg. 18 ²⁷	Prochoros QDSC: 4, 17	Aristotle, <i>Metaph.</i> I, 988b24–26

Philosophus in II *Metaphysice*, reprehendit ponentes

materiam corporalem primum principium, quia ponebant solum elementa corporum, non corporum autem non.

ὅ Φιλόσοφος ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν Μετὰ τὰ Φυσικὰ καθάπτεται τῶν τιθεμένων τὴν σωματικὴν ὅλην πρώτην ἀρχὴν πάντων διὰ τὸ δοξάζειν μόνα σωματικὰ στοιχεῖα.

...τῶν γὰρ σωμάτων τὰ στοιχεῖα τιθέασι μόνον, τῶν δ’ ἀσωμάτων οὕ, ὄντων καὶ ἀσωμάτων.

The same applies for Aquinas' quotations of certain Latin writings available to him in Greek translation:

²⁴ Thomas Aquinas QDSC, ed. J. Cos, p. 44.

Aquinas <i>QDSC</i> : a. 4 arg. 20 ²⁹	Prochoros <i>QDSC</i> : 4, 19	Augustine, <i>Trinit. VI</i> , cap. 6, 8 / trans. Planudes (c. 1280/81)
...quod dicit Augustinus in III <i>De Trinitate</i> , quod anima “in toto tota est et in qualibet parte eius tota”.	...τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Αὐγουστίνου εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ <i>Περὶ Τριάδος</i> τρίτῳ, ὅτι ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν ὅλῳ ὅλῃ ἔστι καὶ ἐν ὅτῳδήποτε μέρει αὐτοῦ ὅλη.	... καὶ ἐν ὅλῳ ὅλῃ ἔστι καὶ ἐν ἐκάστῳ αὐτοῦ μέρει ὅλη. ³⁰

When it comes to Scriptural quotations, Prochoros' translation is very close, but not always identical, to the Greek wording.³¹ At first sight this departure from the original seems odd, given that he was a monk and he must have known his Bible by heart. However, this convention reflects his priority to accurately render the Latin text at the expense of a faithful quotation of the Greek Bible – except when he quotes it from memory in its Greek version, seeing that it does not differ from its Latin version in Aquinas' text.³²

The following examples show that Prochoros quotes the original Greek wording, but does not hesitate to depart when he thinks he can choose a more accurate rendering of the Latin wording in Aquinas' text.³³

29 Thomas Aquinas *QDSC*, ed. J. Cos, p. 52.

30 Augustine, *Αὐγουστίνου Περὶ Τριάδος βιβλία πεντεκαιδεκα, ἀπερ ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετήνευκε Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης. Εἰσαγαγή, ἐλληνικὸ καὶ λατινικὸ κείμενο, γλωσσάριο. Editio princeps*, eds. Papathomopoulos, Tsavari and Rigotti, Vol. I, Athens 1995, p. 403.

31 We have consulted the standard edition of the Septuagint by A. Rahlf and R. Hanhart, *Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes. Editio altera*, Stuttgart 2006 (available online at <https://www.academic-bible.com/en/online-bibles/septuagint-lxx/read-the-bible-text/>). Concerning the New Testament, we have used the publication by *The Center for Study and Preservation of the Majority Text* (CSPMT) (available online at <http://cspmt.org/>), which is “dedicated to scholarly study, research and preservation of Byzantine Greek New Testament manuscripts.” For the dissemination of the Bible in Byzantium and the transmission of the text of the Greek New Testament in Byzantium in particular, as found in manuscripts of the period (*textus receptus*), see Krueger and Nelson 2017, 1–20 (esp. p. 2, n. 2).

32 Cf. Hunger 1984a, 82.

Aquinas QDSC a.6 arg.14 ³³ Laudate eum celi celorum	Prochoros QDSC: 6, 14 αἰνεῖτε αὐτὸν οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν·	Ps., 148, 4 αἰνεῖτε αὐτόν, οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τὸ ὅδωρ τὸ ὑπεράνω τῶν οὐρανῶν.
Aquinas q. 3 a. 6 arg. 16 in principio creationis rerum erant tenebrae super faciem abyssi.	Prochoros QDP 3.6.16 ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς τῶν ὄντων δημιουργίας, ἦν σκότος, ἐπὶ ³⁴ πᾶν τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς ἀβύσσου.	Gen., 1,1 ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, καὶ σκότος ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου, καὶ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος
Aquinas QDSC a.6 arg.14 ³⁴ Exulta super eam celum	Prochoros QDSC: 6, 14 ἀγαλλιῶ ἐπ' αὐτὴν ὁ οὐρανός	Apoc., 18, 20 Εὐφραίνου ἐπ' αὐτῇ, οὐρανέ, καὶ οἱ ἄγιοι καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφῆται, ὅτι ἔκρινεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ κρίμα ὑμῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς.

There is an instance where Prochoros' translation has a different biblical quotation than the one found in Aquinas' text. This confirms that Prochoros was translating from a Latin manuscript which contained Ecclesiastes 3, 14 and not John 4, 24 as in the Taurini edition of the Latin text:

Aquinas q. 3 a. 6 arg. 24	Prochoros QDP 3.6.24	Ecclesiastes 3, 14:
Didici quod omnia opera quae fecit Deus, perserverant in aeternum	ἔμαθον ὅτι πάντα τὰ ἔργα ὅσα πεποίκεν ὁ Θεός, διαμένει εἰς τὸν αἰώνα	ἔγνων ὅτι πάντα, ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεός, αύτὰ ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰώνα

The fact that Prochoros does not *verbatim* quote *Ecclesiastes* in the example above further supports that he was translating from Latin and that this different citation was not his own adjustment.

As in the case of Demetrios Cydones,³⁵ Prochoros' main aim was to render faithfully and accurately Aquinas' references from Latin into stylish Atticizing Greek, rather than literally restoring the Greek biblical quotations.

The examples examined above illustrate that Prochoros followed a translating technique similar to that of his brother, adopting a method combining *ad verbum* and *ad sensum*.³⁶ This approach reflects the tradition of preceding Byzantine translators of Latin texts. Among the first scholars and teachers who translated whole Latin works

³³ Thomas Aquinas QDSC, ed. J. Cos, p. 67.

³⁴ Thomas Aquinas QDSC, ed. J. Cos, p. 67.

³⁵ See Kalamakis 1996, 44.

³⁶ See Copenhaver 1988, 77–110.

— mostly theological and philosophical treatises, grammars, and literary texts – into refined Greek were Maximos Planoudes (ca. 1255–1305) and Manuel Holobolos (b. ca. 1245, d. 1310–1314).³⁷

Herbert Hunger, in his edition of Prochoros' unfinished translation of Augustine's *De libero arbitrio* and Ps.-Augustine's *De decem plagis Aegyptiorum*, gives an account of the main characteristics of Prochoros' translation based on representative word lists. These include a list of Latin words that Prochoros expanded in his Greek translation, a list of cases of *periphrasis*, and a list of Latin phrases rendered into Greek with a single word.³⁸ In his edition, Hunger confirmed his view (expressed in 1984) that “it never fails to amaze the reader how Prochoros' word-for-word translation can be so faithful to the wording of the Latin original and at the same time be a perfectly readable, even elegant, text in itself”.³⁹ His overall assessment is that Prochoros “retains his position as a translator, who not only masters the Latin language, but also has a good command of Greek”.⁴⁰ In his edition of Prochoros' autograph translation of Boethius' *De topicis differentiis*, Dimitrios Nikitas focused purely on linguistic elements (grammatical, syntactical, phonological and semantics) as well as on Prochoros' own scribal conventions, errors and corrections, without offering an assessment of the translating method and quality, though his observations identify certain “idiosyncrasies and divergences” in Prochoros' “generally Atticizing language”.⁴¹

Indeed, Prochoros' translating approach reflects this balance between ἀκρίβεια and οἰκονομία that many Byzantine authors and theologians strived to achieve, with various degrees of success. Concerning Prochoros' translation of the two *Quaestiones*, it is hoped that the examination above has amply demonstrated the method and technique he adopted, at the same time showing his command of Latin and Greek, and, overall, the high quality of his work. It is regrettable that we do not possess a working copy of Prochoros' translations, as we do for Demetrios' translation of the *Summa theologiae*, which shows the stages of development of his translating process – unless such a copy exists and has not been discovered yet.

To sum up, Prochoros displays a thorough understanding of Latin and an excellent ability of rendering it into very good Greek. In his effort to remain close to the Latin original and at the same time communicate its *sententiae*, he adjusts the Latin structure for the translated text to sound more natural in Greek. This, however, does not prevent him from introducing certain Latinisms, apparently influenced by the Latin syntax. Style plays an essential role in his translation, as is evident from his varied vocabulary in translating Latin terms, his effort to avoid repetition, and his care for conciseness when needed, in order to better convey the meaning of the Latin, avoid-

³⁷ See Fisher 2002, 77–78.

³⁸ See Hunger 1990b, 70–75.

³⁹ Hunger 1984a, 15, cited in Hunger 1990b, 71. My translation from German.

⁴⁰ Hunger 1990b, 70–71. My translation.

⁴¹ Nikitas 1990, cxix.

ing verbosity. In his translation of quotations cited in Aquinas' text, Prochoros prefers to remain faithful to the Latin wording rather than quoting the respective Greek *verbatim*, except in the case of certain biblical passages that he clearly quotes from memory. Apart from these adaptations, intervention is limited to additions and corrections of book and chapter numbers in the Greek text, if indeed these were introduced by Prochoros.

On the whole, Prochoros Cydones proves himself a skillful translator, capable of producing a high-quality Greek translation of Thomistic works, to be consulted, used, and circulated among Byzantine theologians and intellectuals in general, and providing additional ammunition in the theological arsenal against the Palamite group in particular. In the process, following parallel steps with his older brother, Prochoros served well the philosophical and theological dialogue between the Greek East and the Latin West, by promoting the study of Aquinas' works and introducing western Scholastic thought to the Orthodox world, in a period when Byzantium was once more facing the need to define its orthodoxy, orthopraxy and, ultimately, identity.⁴²

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abbreviations

a.	articulus
Apoc.	Apocalypsis
arg.	argumentum
c.	circa
cap.	caput
cols.	columns
<i>De an.</i>	<i>De anima</i>
<i>Gen.</i>	<i>Genesis</i>
<i>Metaph.</i>	<i>Metaphysica</i>
MS	manuscript
MSS	manuscripts
PG	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i>
Phys.	<i>Physica</i>
Ps.	<i>Psalm</i>
q.	quaestio
qq.	quaestiones
<i>QDP</i>	<i>Quaestiones disputatae de potentia</i>
<i>QDSC</i>	<i>Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis</i>

⁴² See, for example, Manuel Chrysoloras' and Isidore of Kiev's comments on the mixed Hellenic and Roman identity of the Byzantines cited in Dendrinos n.d., 15–16 with note 63. See also Kaldellis 2007 and Kaldellis 2015.

<i>resp.</i>	<i>responsio</i>
<i>Trinit.</i>	<i>De Trinitate</i>

Primary Sources

Aristotle, *De anima*, ed. D. Ross, Oxford 1961.

Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, ed. W. Jaeger, Oxford 1957.

Aristotle, *Physica*, ed. W. D. Ross, Oxford 1950.

Augustine, *De Trinitate*, tr. by Maximos Planudes: *Αύγουστίνου Περὶ Τριάδος βιβλία πεντεκαίδεκα, ἀπερ ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετήνεγκε Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης. Εἰσαγωγή, ἑλληνικὸ καὶ λατινικὸ κείμενο, γλωσσάριο. Editio princeps. Vol. I, M. eds Papathomopoulos, I. Tsavari, G. Rigotti, Athens 1995.*

Dositheus Magister, *Ars grammatica*, ed. J. Tolkiehn, *Dosithei ars grammatica*, Leipzig, 1913.

Ps-Dositheus Magister, *Hermeneumata*, ed. G. Goetz, *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum*, t. III, Leipzig, 1892.

Ps-Dositheus Magister, *Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum*, *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum*, t. VI-VII, Leipzig, 1899; 1903.

Patrologia Graeca (Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca), ed. J. P. Migne, 1857--1866.

Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*, in *Sancti Thomae De Aquino, Opera Omnia. Iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita cura et studio fratrum praedicatorum*, ed. Cos J., t. 24, 2 (Rome / Paris, 2000).

Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestiones disputatae*, t. 2: *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia*, ed. P. M. Pession (10^a edition: Marietti), Taurini/Romae, 1965, p. 1–276.

Secondary Sources

Candal, M. (1954). "El libro VI de Próchoro Cidonio [sobre la luz tabórica]". In: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 20, pp. 247–296.

Copenhaver, B. P. (1988). "Translation, Terminology and Style in Philosophical Discourse". In: *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*. Ed. by C. B. Schmitt and Q. a. Skinner. Cambridge, pp. 77–110.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. "Prochoros Kydones". In: *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Begründet von Fr. Überweg. Die Philosophie des Mittelalters. Band 1/1: Jüdische und byzantinische Philosophie. Bandteil: Byzantinische Philosophie*. Ed. by G. Kaprev. Forthcoming. Basel.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2002b). "Georgios Gennadios II – Scholarios' 'Florilegium Thomisticum'. His Early Abridgment of Various Chapters and 'Quæstiones' of Thomas Aquinas' *Summae* and His anti-Plethonism". In: *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 69.1, pp. 117–171.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2004b). *Πλήθων καὶ Θωμᾶς Ακυνάτης: ἀπὸ τὴν ιστορία τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ θωμισμοῦ*. Greek Byzantium and the Latin West: Philosophy – Studies 2. Athens.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2007a). "Georgios Gennadios II – Scholarios' 'Florilegium Thomisticum II' ('De Fato') and its anti-Plethonic Tenor". In: *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales* 74.2, pp. 301–376.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2010a). "Demetrius Cydones' Translation of Bernardus Guidonis' List of Thomas Aquinas' Writings and the Historical Roots of Byzantine Thomism". In: *1308. Eine*

Topographie historischer Gleichzeitigkeit. Ed. by A. Speer and D. Wirmer. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 35. Berlin and New York, pp. 827–881.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2015). "Prochoros Cydones". In: *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Christian East*. Ed. by E. G. Farrugia. Rome, pp. 582–583.

Dendrinos, C. *Co-operation and friendship among scholars in the circle of Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus (1390–1425) as reflected in their autograph manuscripts*, Paper presented at International colloquium *Unlocking the potential of texts: interdisciplinary perspectives on Medieval Greek*, organised by the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities, University of Cambridge, 18–19 July 2006, Cambridge, 2007. URL: [https://pure.royalholloway.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/cooperation-and-friendship-among-scholars-in-the-circle-of-emperor-manuel-ii-palaeologus-13901425-as-reflected-in-their-autograph-manuscripts\(f3fb3f0a-270f-428b-8da0-1f1b33d00c88\).html](https://pure.royalholloway.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/cooperation-and-friendship-among-scholars-in-the-circle-of-emperor-manuel-ii-palaeologus-13901425-as-reflected-in-their-autograph-manuscripts(f3fb3f0a-270f-428b-8da0-1f1b33d00c88).html).

Filovski, J. (1973). "Beleški kon deloto Peri ousias kai energeias od Grigorij Akindin". In: *Živa antika* 23, pp. 33–67.

Filovski, J. and M. D. Petruševski (1973 and 1976). "Grēgoriou tou Akindynou Πραγματεία εἰς τὸ περὶ οὐσίας καὶ ἐνέργειας ζήτημα". In: *Živa antika* 23 (36–67, 317–367), 24 (295–331), 26 (161–192, 487–499).

Fisher, E. (2002). "Planoudes, Holobolos, and the motivation for translation". In: *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 43.3, pp. 77–78.

Glycofrydi-Leontsini, A. (2003b). "Demetrios Cydones as a translator of Latin texts". In: *Porphyrogenita. Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*. Ed. by C. Dendrinos et al. London and Burlington, pp. 174–185.

Hunger, H. (1984a). *Prochoros Kydones, Übersetzung von acht Briefen des Hl. Augustinus*. Wiener Studien 9. Vienna.

Hunger, H. (1990b). *Prochoros Kydones' Übersetzungen von S. Augustinus, De libero arbitrio I.1–90, und Ps.-Augustinus, De decem plagis Aegyptiorum*. Wiener Studien 14. Vienna.

Kalamakis, D., ed. (1996). Ἀνθολόγιον ἐκ τῶν ἔργων Αύγουστίνου Ἰππάνος, ἐξελληνισθὲν ὑπὸ Δημητρίου τοῦ Κυδώνη. Athens.

Kaldellis, A. (2007). *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*. Cambridge.

Kaldellis, A. (2015). *The Byzantine Republic: People and Power in New Rome*. Cambridge, MA.

Krueger, D. and R. S. Nelson (2017). "New Testaments of Byzantium: Seen, Heard, Written, Excerpted, Interpreted". In: *The New Testament in Byzantium*. Ed. by D. Krueger and R. S. Nelson. Washington, D.C., pp. 1–20.

Lössl, J. (2007). *Augustinus, De vera religione / Über die wahre Religion. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Paderborn et al.

Mercati, G. (1931a). *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota: ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV*. Vatican City.

Nicol, D. M. (1985). "Review of *Prochoros Kydones, Übersetzung von acht Briefen des Hl. Augustinus*". In: *The Classical Review* 35.2, pp. 428–429.

Nikitas, D. (1990). *Boethius, De topicis differentiis καὶ οἱ βιζαντινὲς μεταφράσεις τοῦ Μανουὴλ ὘λοβάλου καὶ τοῦ Προχόρου Κυδώνη*. Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi, Philosophi Byzantini 5. Athens, Paris, and Brussels.

Plested, M. (2012a). *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*. Oxford.

Podskalsky, G. (1977b). *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz. Der Streit um die theologische Methodik in der spätbyzantinischen Geistesgeschichte (14./15. Jahrhundert)*. Munich.

Polemis, I. D. (2012). *Theologica varia inedita saeculi XIV (Auctores varii, Georgius Pelagonius, Anonymus, Prochorus Cydones)*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 76. Turnhout.

Rigo, A. (2004). "Il monte Athos e la controversia palamitica dal concilio del 1351 al Tomo sinodale del 1368: Giacomo Trikanas, Procoro Cidone e Filoteo Kokkinos". In: *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*. Ed. by A. Rigo. Orientalia Venetiana 16. Florence, pp. 1–177.

Russell, N. (2006). "Prochoros Cydones and the Fourteenth-Century Understanding of Orthodoxy". In: *Byzantine Orthodoxies: Papers from the Thirty-Sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantyne Studies*. Ed. by A. Louth and A. Casiday. Aldershot, pp. 73–84.

Ryder, J. R. (2010). *The Career and Writings of Demetrios Kydones: A Study of Fourteenth-Century Byzantine Politics, Religion and Society*. Leiden.

Tinnefeld, F. (1981). *Demetrios Kydones. Briefe*. Vol. 1.1. Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 12. Stuttgart.

Trapp, E. et al., eds. (1990). *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*. Vol. 12. Vienna.

Triantafyllopoulos, C. (2012). "The Thomist Basis of Prochoros Kydones' anti-Palamite Treatise *De essentia et operatione Dei* and the Reaction of the Byzantine Church". In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz: Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen. Akten der 37. Koelner Mediaevistentagung 14.–17. September 2010*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. Miscellanea Mediaevalia 36. Berlin and New York, pp. 411–429.

Tyn, T. (1964). "Prochoros und Demetrios Kydones: der byzantinische Thomismus des XIV Jahrhunderts". In: *Thomas von Aquino: Interpretation und Rezeption*. Ed. by W. Eckert. Mainz, pp. 837–912.

Voordeckers, E. and F. Tinnefeld, eds. (1987). *Ioannis Cantacuzeni Refutationes duae Prochori Cydonii et disputatio cum Paulo patriarcha Latino epistulis septem tradita*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 16. Turnhout.

Wright, C. (2013b). "Towards an edition of Demetrios Kydones's autograph translation of Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*, Prima Pars". In: *When East Met West: The Reception of Latin Philosophical and Theological Thought in Late Byzantium: Acts of the Institute of Classical Studies International Byzantine Colloquium (London, 11–12 June 2012)*. Ed. by J. A. Demetracopoulos and C. Dendrinos. Nicolaus: Rivista di Teologia ecumenico-patristica 40/1, pp. 19–30.

Sergei Mariev

Nature as *instrumentum Dei*

Some aspects of Bessarion's reception of Thomas Aquinas

1 Introduction

The fifteenth century offered scholars from Byzantium and the Latin West numerous opportunities “to learn from each other” and to come to appreciate the value of their respective traditions. In fact, the famous Plato-Aristotle controversy of the fifteenth century can be viewed as a series of episodes in a continuous “learning process”. It started with a small book written by Georgios Gemistos (Plethon) during the Council of Ferrara/Florence (1438/1439), which was without doubt the most important encounter between Byzantine and Western intellectuals in this period. The controversy continued for some time as a battle among Byzantine scholars in Greece and Italy until George of Trebizond “transferred it from the Greeks to the Latins”.¹ Most of the scholars who participated in the debate can be easily classified as “Platonists” or “Aristotelians” insofar as they either defended what they believed to be “Platonic” or “Aristotelian” doctrines or questioned the views of their respective opponents from what they believed to be a “Platonic” or “Aristotelian” point of view. Bessarion’s role in this debate is not easily classifiable in these terms, as he decided not to champion one point of view by criticizing or refuting the other, but wanted to show the superiority of the Platonic perspective, without however calumniating Aristotle or, as he himself put it, “in no way unmindful of Aristotle’s good repute” ($\mu\eta\delta\alpha\mu\circ\tau\tau\eta\varsigma\;\Lambda\tau\iota\sigma\tau\circ\tau\circ\lambda\circ\varsigma\;\epsilon\nu\varphi\eta\eta\eta\circ\varsigma\;\dot{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\theta\circ\mu\eta\circ\eta\circ\circ$).² At the same time he wanted to demonstrate that Aristotelian thought in many respects is not at variance with Platonic thought.³ This study focuses on one particular question that was debated during the long course of the Plato-Aristotle controversy and on Bessarion’s contribution to the debate of this

¹ Cf. Monfasani 2012, 469.

² Cf. Bess. NA, 6.8, ed. S. Mariev et al., Hamburg 2015, p. 148. In the second book of his *In Calumniam Platonis* Bessarion stresses that it is not his intention to offend Aristotle in any way, as he honours both Aristotle and Plato (cf. Bess. ICP, lib. II, cap. 3,2, ed. L. Mohler, in *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann*, Bd. 2, Paderborn 1927, Neudruck: Aalen/Paderborn 1967, pp. 84–86). Bessarion also concedes that some aspects of Platonic philosophy are incompatible with Christian doctrine (Bess. ICP, lib. II, cap. 3,3, p. 86 Mohler). Nonetheless, Platonic philosophy exhibits a closer affinity with Christian doctrine than does Aristotelian philosophy (Bess. ICP, lib. II, cap. 1, p. 80 Mohler).

³ On Bessarion’s conciliatory strategy cf. Mariev, Marchetto, and Luchner 2015, XLIX; cf. Bess. NA, 6.7, pp. 140–146 Mariev et al.; cf. Bess. ICP lib. I, cap. 3,1, pp. 22–24 Mohler.

question: its aim is to investigate the use Bessarion made of the Thomistic notion of nature as an instrument of God within the broader context of his attempt to envisage a fundamental accord between Platonism and Christian doctrine.

2 Theodore Gazes and Bessarion

In 1439 Plethon composed his famous treatise Περὶ ὃν Ἀριστοτέλης πρὸς Πλάτωνα διαφέρεται, which later gave rise to a number of far-reaching debates. In this treatise he mounted a vigorous attack on Aristotle. Among other points, he criticized the Aristotelian thesis that it is absurd not to attribute purposiveness to nature merely because one does not see the agent deliberating, especially since art does not deliberate either, even if it produces for the sake of an end. Plethon objected that it is deliberation that constitutes art as such and art could not remain art if it did not deliberate about its products beforehand. He then argued that if, according to Aristotle himself, art imitates nature, nature must possess that which constitutes art in a far superior and elevated way. So if deliberation is a constitutive element of art, then it must also and to a much higher degree be a constitutive element of nature. Plethon concluded that nature is a divine institution and as such cannot be irrational.⁴

Plethon's criticism occasioned a number of responses. First reactions came from the Greek East and were formulated in particular by George Scholarios, who wrote a treatise in defence of Aristotle (Κατὰ τῶν Πλήθωνος ἀποριῶν ἐπ' Ἀριστοτέλει), to which Plethon responded in another tract, Πρὸς τὰς Σχολαρίου ὑπὲρ Ἀριστοτέλους ἀντιλήψεις.⁵ In the Latin West the controversy arose several years after Plethon's death within the circle of Bessarion. Theodore Gazes⁶ wrote a short text,⁷ in which he defended the Aristotelian position and argued that neither art nor nature deliberates.⁸ He called on Bessarion to provide a demonstration of Plethon's thesis. In fact, Bessar-

⁴ Cf. Mariev 2013, 372–375.

⁵ Cf. Mariev 2014a, 133–139. Cf. Karamanolis 2002a.

⁶ On Theodore Gazes cf. Bianca 1999; Monfasani 2002b.

⁷ This text is now lost, but its content is summarized in chapter 1 of Bessarion's *De natura et arte* (cf. Mariev, Marchetto, and Luchner 2015).

⁸ Cf. Bess. *NA*, 1.1–2, pp. 6–8 Mariev et al. Theodore made use of two arguments: first, he pointed out that deliberation pertains to things that entail indeterminacy, i. e. deliberation is about the means with regard to which it is not clear whether or not they will lead to the end. Since both art and nature proceed by definite means towards definite goals, neither art nor nature makes use of deliberation (on this objection cf. Arist. *Eth. Nic.*, III 5, 1112b 8–12 Bywater: τὸ βουλεύεσθαι δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, ἀδήλοις δὲ πῶς ἀποβῆσται, καὶ ἐν οἷς ἀδιόριστον. συμβούλους δὲ παραλαμβάνομεν εἰς τὰ μεγάλα, ἀπιστοῦντες ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ὡς οὐχ ἰκανοῖς διαγνῶναι. Βουλευόμεθα δ' οὐ περὶ τῶν τελῶν ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν πρὸς τὰ τέλη. Cf. also Them. *In Phys.* 62, 18–20 Schenkl: τοῦτο μὲν γάρ ἐν τοῖς ἀπὸ τύχης συμβαίνει καθάπερ εἴρηται, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ὥρισται ἀφ' ἔκαστης ἀρχῆς ἔκαστον τέλος. Cf. Them. *In Phys.* 63, 6–7 Schenkl: ἀλλ' ὥρισται καὶ τῶν ἔργων ἔκαστον καὶ ή τάξις ή φέρουνσα ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον τέλος.

ion accepted Theodore's invitation and composed a short treatise dedicated to this issue, *'Ότι ἡ φύσις βουλεύεται.*⁹ A reworked version of this text is included in the treatise *De natura et arte* as chapter 2. At the beginning of this chapter Bessarion makes his point very clearly: nature does deliberate; however, it is not nature itself that deliberates, but the higher cause that directs nature to its goal.

'Η φύσις κατ' Ἀριστοτέλη τὸν φιλόσοφον καὶ ὄλως αὐτὴν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔνεκά του πάντα ποιεῖ. οὐ γάρ διὰ τοῦτο ῥῆτέον αὐτὴν μὴ ἔνεκά του πάντα ποιεῖν, ὅτι οὐ βουλεύεται. καὶ γάρ καὶ ἡ τέχνη μὴ βουλευομένη ὅμως ἔνεκά του ποιεῖ. σημεῖον δὲ ὡς ἡ τέχνη οὐ βουλεύεται: εἰ γάρ ἦν ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ ἡ τέχνη, οὐκ ἄν ἐβούλεύετο. πρὸς ταῦτα αὐτός τε Πλάτων πρὸ Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ οἱ Πλάτωνος αἵρεσιῶται πάντες ἔνεκά του μὲν πάντα τὴν φύσιν ποιεῖν καὶ μάλα βούλονται, <ὅμοιώς δὲ καὶ τὴν τέχνην,> [suppl. Mariev e cod. marc. gr. 527 : om. cod. marc. gr. 198, Mohler] μὴ βουλευομένην δέ, τοῦτο οὐ συγχωροῦσιν Ἀριστοτέλει. βουλεύεσθαι γάρ δὴ καὶ μάλα, εἰ καὶ μὴ αὐτὴν, ἀλλὰ τὸν γε διὰ πάντων διήκοντα καὶ πᾶσιν ἐφεστῶτα νοῦν τοῖς κατὰ φύσιν γινομένοις καὶ τὴν φύσιν ιθύνοντα καὶ τάττοντα πρὸς τὸ τέλος.¹⁰

According to Aristotle the philosopher and quite in accord with the truth itself, nature produces everything for the sake of an end. Therefore one should not state that it does not produce everything for the sake of some end because it does not deliberate. Art also produces for the sake of an end even though it does not deliberate. A proof that art does not deliberate is this: if art were in a piece of wood, it would not deliberate. Plato himself before Aristotle and all of Plato's followers had argued against this view: on the one hand, they say that nature produces everything for the sake of an end and firmly maintain this view, and in like manner that art produces for the sake of an end. On the other hand, they disagree with Aristotle inasmuch as it does not deliberate. For nature most assuredly does deliberate even though it is not nature itself that deliberates, but the intellect that pervades everything and presides over everything that comes to be according to nature and that steers and directs nature to its goal.

In order to corroborate the thesis that nature's deliberation is the deliberation of the higher cause that guides it, Bessarion adduces the authority of Plato:

εἶναι γὰρ δὴ αὐτὴν βούλεται Πλάτων οὐ τὸ πρῶτον αἴτιον, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἄμεσον μέν, οἷαν δ' ἔχειν πρὸ αὐτῆς ἄλλην αἴτιαν, θειοτέραν τε καὶ ὑψηλοτέραν καὶ νοεράν, βουλῇ καὶ λογισμῷ πάντα ποιοῦσάν τε καὶ πρὸς τὸ τέλος ἄγουσαν, ἄτε δὴ καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῇ τοῦτο προειληφίαν.

For, according to Plato, nature is not the first cause, but an immediate cause, of a kind that has another cause prior to itself, which is more divine, superior and intellectual, and which produces

Cf. also Ioann. Philop. *In Phys.* 321, 9–13 Vitelli). Theodore then added that deliberation pertains to matters of action, not of production, which means that deliberation pertains to prudence, not to art (cf. Arist. *Eth. Nic.*, VI 4, 1140a 20–21 and VI 5, 1140b 4–5 Bywater).

⁹ Cf. Bess. *Libellus: Quod natura consulto agat*, ed. L. Mohler, in *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann*, Bd. 3, Paderborn 1942, Neudruck: Aalen/Paderborn 1967, pp. 88–90 and Monfasani 1994.

¹⁰ Bess. *NA*, 2.1, p. 10, 4–16 Mariev et al. This text corresponds to Bess. *Libellus*, p. 89, 3–11 Mohler. On Bessarion's *Libellus* and its relationship to *De natura et arte*, cf. Mariev 2013, 368, note 6.

everything with deliberation and reasoning, and directs everything to its end inasmuch as it anticipates this end within itself.¹¹

Obviously, Bessarion is referring here not only to Plato's concept of nature, but also to that of Neoplatonic philosophers, and in particular to Simplikios and Proklos. In many passages of *De natura et arte* (i. e. in both the Greek and Latin versions) Bessarion even makes explicit reference to Simplikios' conception of nature as a by-cause and instrumental cause that merely transmits, without knowledge or reflexivity, what it receives from higher, intellectual and genuinely efficient causes.¹² A significant passage of the Latin version A of the *De natura et arte* (i. e. of the translation made by Bessarion himself and preserved in Cod. marc. gr. 527 as an appendix to the Greek text¹³) also shows clear and very close dependence on Proklos' *Commentary on Plato's Timaios*, and in particular on the famous *Digression on Nature* in which Proklos explains what nature is according to Plato, describing it as the last demiurgic cause and instrument of the gods.¹⁴ Proklos and Simplikios are Bessarion's main sources for what he considers to be the "Platonic" concept of nature. However, Bessarion does not limit himself to integrating this "Platonic" concept of nature as instrumental cause into his own theoretical framework. In the passage of chapter 2 of *De natura et arte* under consideration here, having stated what he considers to be the Platonic teaching, Bessarion adduces some theses of Thomas Aquinas without referring to him by name:

¹¹ Bess. NA, 2.1, p. 12, 1–5 Mariev et al.

¹² Cf. Bess. NA, 9.5, p. 188, 7–10 Mariev et al.: “‘ὅμα γὰρ τῷ καὶ αὐτὴν γίνεσθαι ποιεῖ’, Σιμπλίκιος φησιν, ‘ένφυτα καὶ ζωή τις οὖσα καὶ τοῦ εἰδούς ἐφιεμένη, συναίτιον δὲ ὡς ἄλλα πρὸ αὐτῆς αἴτια ἔχουσα, τά τε προσεχῆ τά τε ἀνωτέρω’” and cf. Simpl. *In Phys.* 313,5–314,9 Diels. Cf. Bess. NA, Version A: 227r–227v, p. 169–171 Mariev et al.: “Natura igitur, quamvis alicuius causa agat, et ex seipsa quodammodo operet, tamen non advertens aut secum cogitans seque respiciens agit immediate. Quod idem a Simplicio quoque viro doctissimo expositum est. ‘Prima potissimum causa, inquit, agit alicuius causa prospiciens et consultans, [227v] instrumentalis autem causa et propinqua, hoc est natura et res naturalis, agit quidem alicuius causa sed non prospiciens et consultans. Cum enim natura ipsa non sit prima atque potissima causa, sed ministra sit [in mg. add.] primae, agit quidem alicuius causa, sed non cogitans quid agat aut cuius causa agat, verum superiori rectricique suae causae intelligenti animadvertentique subministrat.’” and cf. also Simpl. *In Phys.* 372, 15–18 Diels. On Simplikios' concept of nature, cf. Golitsis 2008. On Bessarion's reception and use of Simplikios in his *De natura et arte*, cf. Mariev, Marchetto, and Luchner 2015.

¹³ On the Latin versions A and B, cf. Mariev, Marchetto, and Luchner 2015, XXVII–XXVIII.

¹⁴ Cf. Bess. NA, Version A: 227r, p. 169 Mariev et al.: “Proclus etiam ‘Natura, inquit, corpora subiecta ipsa separari ab eis non potest. Et rursus, Natura est, inquit autore Platone, essentia incorporea inseparabilis a suis corporibus rationes corporum in se continens, quamquam ad se ipsa respicere nequeat. Instrumentum enim deorum est, non tamen quod vitae expers neque quod aliunde tantummodo moveantur, sed quod ut de se mobile quodammodo sit, obtineat. Ideo quod vel de se ipsa natura agere potest.’” and cf. Prokl. *In Tim.* I 11, 9–11 Diehl; Prokl. *In Tim.* I 12, 21 Diehl. Bessarion also refers to Proklos' *Elements of Theology* (cf. Bess. NA, 9.6, p. 192,1–2 Mariev et al.). On Proklos' concept of nature cf. Martijn 2010 and Lernould 2012. On Bessarion's reception of Proklos cf. Hankins 1990 and Macé, Steel, and D'Hoine 2009.

διχῶς γὰρ δή τι τῇ ίδιᾳ ἐνεργείᾳ τείνειν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος, ἢ ὡς ἂν ἔαυτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος κινοῦν ὡς ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔχοντα λόγον, ἢ ὡς ἂν ἐπ' ἑκεῖνο ὑπὸ ἄλλου κινούμενον ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ τοξότου τὸ βέλος καὶ ὅλως πάντα τὰ ἄψυχα ὑπὸ τινος ἔχοντος λόγον, ἢ οὐδὲ τάττουσιν οὐδὲ κινοῦσιν ἔαυτὰ ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος, || ἀλλ' ὑπὸ ἄλλου νοῦν ἔχοντος δηλαδὴ καὶ κινοῦνται καὶ πρὸς τὸ τέλος ιθύνονται. οἷον δὴ καὶ τὴν φύσιν εἶναι ὄργανικὸν αἴτιον οὕσαν.¹⁵

A thing tends to an end, by its own activity, in two ways: either as a thing moving itself to the end, as man and everything that has reason, or as a thing moved by another to that end, as the arrow through being moved by the archer and all unsouled beings through being moved by someone who has reason; they do not ordain or move themselves to the end, but are moved and directed towards the end by another who has intellect. Nature is also of this sort since it is an instrumental cause.

Bessarion possessed a large number of Thomas Aquinas' works both in Greek and in Latin¹⁶ and made ample use of him throughout his oeuvre. It appears that Demetrios Kydones' translations of Thomas into Greek formed the main but not the only channel that Bessarion used to access a number of Thomas' writings. In his library we find, for example, both Demetrios Kydones' translation of Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* Ia-IIae (Cod. marc. gr. Z 147, coll. 1044, ff. 17r–491v)¹⁷ and the *Compendium* of a part of Thomas' *Summa Theologiae* Ia-IIae (Cod. marc. gr. Z 148, coll. 488, ff. 525r–532v)¹⁸ that Bessarion himself composed, possibly during his stay at Mystra in the Peloponnese between 1432 and 1436.¹⁹ When citing Thomas, Bessarion largely relied on Kydones' translation, but felt free to improve Kydones' translation with regard to both style and content.²⁰ In the passage of chapter 2 of *De natura et arte* under examination, Bessarion clearly uses Thomistic material from the *Summa Theologiae* Ia-IIae, q. 1, a. 2 co, even though he does not name Aquinas, as the comparison with Thomas' text demonstrates:

Tamen considerandum est quod aliquid sua actione vel motu tendit ad finem dupliciter, uno modo, sicut seipsum ad finem movens, ut homo; alio modo, sicut ab alio motum ad finem, sicut sagitta tendit ad determinatum finem ex hoc quod movetur a sagittante, qui suam actionem dirigit in finem. Illa ergo quae rationem habent, seipsa movent ad finem, quia habent dominium suorum actuum per liberum arbitrium, quod est facultas voluntatis et rationis. Illa vero quae ratione carent, tendunt in finem per naturalem inclinationem, quasi ab alio mota, non autem a seipsis, cum non cognoscant rationem finis, et ideo nihil in finem ordinare possunt, sed solum in

¹⁵ Bess. *NA*, 2.1, p. 12, 5–12 ed. Mariev et al.

¹⁶ A full list is contained in Athanasopoulos 2017c.

¹⁷ Cf. Mioni 1981c and Monfasani 2011a, Appendix I, n. 5, p. 175.

¹⁸ Cf. Monfasani 2011a, Appendix I, n. 6, p. 176.

¹⁹ On the date of the composition of the *Compendium* cf. Rigo 1994, 42, n. 153. Cf. also Rigo 2012, 28.

²⁰ On Bessarion's access to Thomistic texts cf. Athanasopoulos 2017c; Rigo 1994, esp. 142, n. 153; Todt 2006, 150; Tambrun-Krasker 2013, 15.

finem ab alio ordinantur. Nam tota irrationalis natura comparatur ad Deum sicut instrumentum ad agens principale, ut supra habitum est.²¹

Bessarion uses Thomistic teaching on nature as *instrumentum Dei* in order to corroborate the Platonic thesis according to which nature is not a cause properly so called but an instrumental cause.

3 Bessarion and George of Trebizond

Bessarion's reply to Theodore Gazes fell into the wrong hands. Bessarion's letter came into possession of his enemy, George of Trebizond, who then composed a text, which he addressed to Isaiah, in which he criticized Bessarion's views on nature. He published this "pamphlet" together with the original text of Bessarion's letter to Theodore Gazes.

George of Trebizond raised a series of grave objections against Bessarion's view of nature. Even if one admitted that it is not nature that deliberates, but the intellect that guides nature towards its end, it is not clear whether intellect and nature are one and the same thing or two different entities. If they are one and the same thing, then nature is only a name and not a demiurgic cause. If they are two different entities and nature is an instrument through which the intellect moves, then it becomes necessary to explain how nature – which is immanent in bodies and inseparable from them – can be an instrument, since an instrument is not immanent in that which is moved by it.²² In addition, according to George, it is a blasphemy to maintain that the Intellect, i. e. God who guides nature, deliberates: according to the teaching of Aristotle himself,

²¹ Thom. Aquin. *ST* Ia–Ilae, q. 1, a. 2 co. In a number of passages of the *Summa Theologiae* Thomas Aquinas makes reference to the two ways in which a thing may tend towards an end. In particular, in *Summa Theologiae* Ia–Ilae, q. 1, a.2 Thomas asks whether acting for an end is proper to rational beings. Indeed, it appears that acting for the sake of an end is peculiar to those creatures who are endowed with reason, i. e. have knowledge of the end as such and are capable of directing their activity towards it. However, as Thomas remarks, Aristotle himself, in the second book of *Physics*, attributes to nature the ability to act for a purpose, even though nature is irrational. Thomas concludes that even irrational creatures can act for a purpose. Creatures that lack knowledge of the end actually cannot set themselves in motion towards the end, because they do not know it, but they nevertheless tend towards the end inasmuch as they are moved and directed towards the end by a being that does know it, i. e. by the Creator.

²² The letter in which George of Trebizond criticizes Bessarion's view on nature is included in Bessarion's *De natura et arte* as chapter 3. Cf. Bess. NA, 3.5, p. 54, 2–9 Mariev et al.: ἡρα ἔστιν ἄλλο τοῦ κυβερνήτου νοῦ, καὶ ὅργανον κατὰ σὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦ νοῦ, ὃ ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦ κινεῖται τὰ κινούμενα. οὗ δοθέντος ἔσται ἡ φύσις χωριστὸν πάντως τῶν κινητῶν. ὅπερ ἔστι ψεῦδος οὐρανόμηκες. συμπέφυκε γὰρ καὶ ἐμπέφυκεν ἡ φύσις τοῖς πράγμασιν. ὅργανον δέ ἔστιν, ὃ τὰ κινούμενα ὑπὸ ἄλλου κινεῖται μὴ ἐμπέφυκότι τοῖς κινουμένοις, εἰ γὰρ ἐμπέφυκεν, μέρος τι ἔσται τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ κινουμένου, οὐκ ὅργανον.

deliberation is an investigation that implies doubt and ignorance,²³ and therefore cannot be attributed to God, who knows everything.²⁴

George's criticism was addressed by Bessarion in chapters 4–10 of *De natura et arte*. In response to the last objection, Bessarion explained that to attribute deliberation to the divine Intellect is not a blasphemy, if one considers that the word "deliberation" does not have just a single meaning but is homonymous, i. e. has different meanings according to the activity to which it is referred: if it is referred to the human intellect, deliberation is an inquiry into that which is doubtful or uncertain, in accordance with the teachings of Aristotle in the third book of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. If it is referred to God, however, it does not mean inquiry, but science and the most secure and precise knowledge that necessarily accompanies God's providential activity. On the one hand, Bessarion stressed that Platonic philosophers had never intended to contradict Aristotle on this issue and, on the other hand, he described them as advancing to a conception of deliberation that is higher and more comprehensive than that of Aristotle.²⁵ In order to show the harmony between Platonic and Christian doctrines Bessarion added that, like Plato and the Platonic philosophers, the exegetes of the Bible also had attributed deliberation to God: they did so not because they wanted to describe God as having doubts and being uncertain, but, on the contrary, in order to emphasize the superiority of man over all other creatures.²⁶

In response to the first objection of George, Bessarion pointed out that as long as nature is taken in a single sense, it is obviously impossible to understand how nature can be both instrument and at the same time an immanent principle of movement. He observed that this conception of nature is unilateral and limited. A more complex and profound vision should be able to distinguish several significations of nature, i. e. the many ways in which nature may be said: in one respect nature is a passive principle of motion, a mere capacity to be moved and ordered; in another respect nature is an active principle of motion. Bessarion agrees with George that nature cannot be in an unqualified sense separate from natural entities. Nature is naturally unified with each natural thing and immanent to it and, inasmuch as it is naturally unified with the natural entity, it cannot work as the instrument by means of which the Intellect moves the things moved, since the mover must be distinct from the moved. But if in one respect nature is unified with the natural entity, in another respect it is distinct from it and, insofar as it is as mover distinct from the entity that is moved, nature acts as instrument: it is an efficient cause that serves the higher and truly efficient causes. However, Bessarion specified once more that even if nature in some respect is an effi-

²³ Cf. Bess. *NA*, 3.4, p. 50, 8–9 Mariev et al.: ἡ βουλὴ ζήτησις τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἀμφιγνοουμένων and cf. Arist. *Eth. Nic.*, III 5, 1112b 22–23 Bywater.

²⁴ Cf. Bess. *NA*, 3.6, p. 58 Mariev et al.

²⁵ Cf. Bess. *NA*, 5.1–2, pp. 94–98 Mariev et al. Cf. Marchetto 2015.

²⁶ Cf. Bess. *NA*, 5.7–8, pp. 112–116 Mariev et al.

cient cause and an active principle of movement, it is not an efficient cause properly so called or in a primary sense, but only a by-cause, as Plato teaches:

οὐ γάρ ἡ συμφιεύς, ταύτη ὄργανον, ἀλλ' ἡ κεχώρισται τὸ κινοῦν τοῦ κινουμένου, || ταύτη ἡ φύσις ὑπουργοῦσα ὄργανικὸν τῷ δημιουργικῷ νῷ ποιεῖ. οὐ γάρ κυρίως ποιητικὸν ἡ, ὡς τὸ ὅθεν ἡ κίνησις, φύσις, ὅτι μηδὲ πρῶτον ἐν τοῖς ποιητικοῖς, ἀλλ' ὁ θεός πρότερον. πᾶσα δὲ αἰτία μὴ ἀρχική, ἡ κινουμένη κινεῖ, ὄργανική αἰτία καὶ συναντία λέγεται παρὰ Πλάτωνι.²⁷

For nature is not an instrument, inasmuch as it is naturally unified, but nature acts by serving as an instrument to the demiurgic intellect, inasmuch as that which moves is distinct from that which is moved. For nature, as that out of which the movement originates, is efficient not in the proper sense of the word, because nature is not the first among the efficient causes, for God is prior to it. All causes that are not principal and that move by being moved are called by Plato instrumental causes or by-causes.

It is here that Bessarion made reference to “our theologians, especially the Latin ones” and quoted once more from the *Summa theologiae* Ia–Ilae:²⁸

φασὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι θεολόγοι, καὶ μάλιστα γε λατίνοι, οὗτοί γε καὶ περὶ πλείστου μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ παντός Ἀριστοτέλη ποιούμενοι, τὴν ὅλην φύσιν ὡς ὄργανον πρὸς τὸ πρώτως ποιοῦν, οὕτω πρὸς τὸν θεόν παραβάλλεσθαι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἴδιον τῆς λογικῆς εἶναι φύσεως ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος φέρεσθαι, ὡς ἀν ἔσατὴν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος ἀγούσης· τῆς δὲ ἀλόγου, ὡς ἀν ὑφ' ἐτέρου ἀγομένης, ἡ εἰς τὸ καταλαμβανόμενον τέλος, ὥσπερ τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα, ἡ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄγνωστον, ὥσπερ τὰ παντάπασι γνώσεως ἐστερημένα. ἀνάγκη γὰρ πάντα τὰ λόγου ἐστερημένα κινεῖσθαι πρὸς τὸ μερικὸν τέλος ὑπὸ τινος λογικῆς θελήσεως, ἥτις ἔσατὴν ἐκτείνει πρὸς τὸ καθόλου τέλος, δηλονότι τῆς θείας θελήσεως.²⁹

Our theologians, and especially the Latin ones, who value above all Aristotle to the highest degree, also say that the whole of nature is in comparison to God as an instrument to the primary agent. Consequently it is proper to the rational nature to tend to an end, as directing itself to the end: whereas it is proper to the irrational nature to tend to an end, as directed by another, whether it apprehends the end, as do irrational animals, or does not apprehend it, as is the case with those things that are altogether void of knowledge. [...] Consequently all things that lack

²⁷ Bess. NA, 8.4, p. 168, 7–12 Mariev et al.

²⁸ Cf. Thom. Aquin. ST Ia–Ilae q. 1, a. 2 co.: Illa ergo quae rationem habent, seipsa movent ad finem, quia habent dominium suorum actuum per liberum arbitrium, quod est facultas voluntatis et rationis. Illa vero quae ratione carent, tendunt in finem per naturalem inclinationem, quasi ab alio mota, non autem a seipsis, cum non cognoscant rationem finis, et ideo nihil in finem ordinare possunt, sed solum in finem ab alio ordinantur. Nam tota irrationalis natura comparatur ad Deum sicut instrumentum ad agens principale, ut supra habitum est. Et ideo proprium est naturae rationalis ut tendat in finem quasi se agens vel ducens ad finem, naturae vero irrationalis, quasi ab alio acta vel ducta, sive in finem apprehensum, sicut bruta animalia, sive in finem non apprehensum, sicut ea quae omnino cognitione carent. Cf. Thom. Aquin. ST Ia–Ilae q. 1, a. 2 ad 3: Et ideo necesse est quod omnia quae carent ratione, moveantur in fines particulares ab aliqua voluntate rationali, quae se extendit in bonum universale, scilicet a voluntate divina.

²⁹ Bess. NA, 8.4, p. 170, 1–11 Mariev et al.

reason are, of necessity, moved to their particular ends by some rational will, which extends to the universal end, namely by the Divine will.

The aim of Bessarion's reference to "our" theologians, and especially the Latin ones who recognise and value the authority of Aristotle above all, now becomes evident: if a Christian and Aristotelian like Thomas Aquinas can be shown to uphold a thesis that is in complete accord with Platonic philosophy, then (1) Platonism is in harmony with Christian thought, and (2) Aristotelian thought is not irreconcilable with Platonic teaching, and thus to follow Aristotle does not necessarily bring with it disdain for Plato, as George seems to believe.

4 Nature as instrumental cause in George of Trebizond's *Comparatio*

When Bessarion was writing his response to the pamphlet of George of Trebizond, he knew that George had already published his Latin *Comparatio philosophorum*, but he had not yet had an opportunity to read it. In fact, it was from George's pamphlet that Bessarion, as he himself professed in *De natura et arte*, learned about the existence of the *Comparatio*. It was only after the completion of the Greek version of *De natura et arte* that Bessarion finally managed to obtain a copy of the *Comparatio*, read it and took the decision to compose a comprehensive reply to this calumniator of Plato, his famous *In Calumniatorem Platonis*.

It must have been a great surprise for Bessarion to discover that George, who in his letter to Isaiah had criticized the concept of nature as instrumental cause, introduced the same concept in his *Comparatio*. In this work, George of Trebizond pursues one main objective, namely to demonstrate, on the one hand, that Platonic philosophy is incompatible with Christian doctrine and, on the other hand, that Aristotelian thought is not only consistent with Christian doctrine, but even anticipates some of the fundamental Christian theses. In particular, in Book 2, chapter 10, 74–76, George mentions the Aristotelian doctrine formulated in *On Generation and Corruption* II 10, according to which the zodiac and the movement of the sun are inclined in order that coming-to-be and passing-away may continually occur. In the interpretation of George, this passage proves that according to Aristotle the zodiac and the celestial bodies have been brought into existence for the sake of the continuity of generation and corruption, and consequently the passage demonstrates that the heavens are, according to Aristotle, nothing else but a divine instrumental cause.

⁷⁴ In secundo igitur *De Generatione* iuxta calcem legitur quod obliquatio tum zodiaci, tum ipsius motus solis, qui circulum per medium signorum suo motu describit, causa efficiens generatio-nis atque corruptionis est, quodque hoc modo universum adimpletur a deo quia generacionem fecit continuam. ⁷⁵ Si ergo universum adimpletum est quia generatio facta est a deo continua, hoc

autem factum per obliquationem zodiaci et motus solaris, precipue ostendit zodiacum et solem et omnino celestia corpora propter generationem facta esse divinitus. 76 Non est celum principalis causa generationis secundum ipsum, sed quasi organica atque instrumentalis. Natura enim instrumentum dei non iniuria dici potest et celum ipsum, cuius motu atque ambitu hec inferiora et moventur et quiescent.³⁰

74 In Book 2 of the *On Generation*, therefore, towards the end, one reads that the oblique path of the zodiac and of the motion of the sun itself, which describes by its motion a circle through the middle of the signs of the zodiac, is the efficient cause of generation and corruption, and that in this way the universe is filled by God because he causes continual generation. 75 If therefore the universe is filled because continual generation is caused by God, and if, moreover, this is achieved through the oblique path of the zodiac and of the motion of the sun, Aristotle is showing in particular that the zodiac and the sun and the celestial bodies as a whole were divinely made for the sake of generation. 76 The heavens are not, according to him, the principal cause of generation, but, as it were, a tool and an instrumental cause. For it can be fairly said that nature is the instrument of God, and so are the heavens, by whose motion and circular path the things here below are moved and made to rest.

At this point George adds some observations to make clear what an instrumental cause is and how it operates. He specifies that it is impossible to tend to an end without knowing the end. If nature is oriented towards an end, even though it does not have knowledge of this end, this means, in George's view, that nature tends to an end because it is guided by God, who knows the end and directs the irrational entities towards it. For George this is actually what Aristotle taught, given that Aristotle himself almost never says that nature does nothing in vain, but that God and nature do nothing in vain, which means, in his view, that according to Aristotle nature is oriented towards an end because it is guided and directed by God towards this end:

77 Instrumentalis enim causa proprie est que gratia finis non sua, sed superioris alicuius cognitione operatur. Natura vero nihil facit frustra, sed omnia propter finem et quidem optimum facit, nec ullo pacto cognoscit. 78 Gratia vero finis absque ulla cognitione facere penitus impossibile est. Nam quod ordine certo semper tendit ad finem, necessario aut cognoscit finem aut a cognoscente dirigitur. 79 Propterea nunquam pene Aristoteles naturam dicit nihil facere frustra, sed deum et naturam ut ostendat cognitione dei, non sua nihil frustra naturam agere.³¹

77 For an instrumental cause properly is what operates not for its own sake, but under the cognition of something higher. Nature in fact does nothing in vain, but does everything for a purpose and indeed to the best results, and it is not in any way cognizant [of the purpose]. 78 On the other hand, to work purposely without cognition is utterly impossible. For that which always tends towards an end in a certain order is necessarily cognizant of the end or is directed to it by what is cognizant of it. 79 For this reason, Aristotle almost never says nature does nothing in vain, but

30 Georg. Trapez. *Comparatio*, II 10, 74–76. I thank Prof. Monfasani for supplying me with a draft of the edition he is preparing and with the English translation.

31 Georg. Trapez. *Comparatio*, II 10, 77–79.

that God and nature do nothing in vain, thus showing that it is by God's cognition and not by its own that nature does nothing in vain.

However, George does not limit himself to integrating the concept of nature as *instrumentum dei* into his own demonstrations. He goes further than this: he takes as a point of departure the thesis that the celestial bodies have been created for the sake of an end, and arrives at the conclusion that, according to Aristotle himself, the celestial bodies have been created by an agent endowed with intellect and through an act of will. With this argument George believes that he has shown that Aristotle is in perfect accord with Christian doctrine:

Si ergo generationem deus facit continuam, generatio autem continua motu celestium corporum fit, motus certe celestes gratia finis facti sunt, et mobilia igitur. 81 Facta sunt autem a primo principio. Ab ipso enim dependent. A voluntate igitur eius, non a natura dependent. Nam quod factum ab aliquo est, et precipue propter finem, a voluntate vel agentis cause vel agentem dirigentis omnino factum est. [...]83 Quasobres non a natura dei, sed a voluntate mundus dependet secundum Aristotelem.³²

If therefore God makes continual generation and if continual generation is the result of the motion of the celestial bodies, then certainly the celestial motions have been made for the sake of an end, and so too therefore the movable celestial bodies. 81 They are made by the first principle. They are indeed dependent on him. They are dependent on his will, not on his nature. For what has been made by someone and especially for the sake of an end, is generally made by an act of will, either of the agent cause or of the cause that directs the agent [...] 83 Hence, according to Aristotle, the world is dependent not on God's nature, but on God's will.

³² Georg. Trapez. *Comparatio*, II 10, 80–83. A similar argumentative strategy is employed by Thomas Aquinas in his *Contra Gentiles* II, q. 23. There Thomas takes as his point of departure the idea that nature is directed to its end by a principal agent that knows the end, and he arrives at the conclusion that the principal agent, i. e. God, acts not by necessity of his nature but by his intellect and will. Cf. Thom. Aquin. *CG* II, q. 23, n. 6: “Deum agere propter finem ex hoc manifestum esse potest quod universum non est a casu, sed ad aliquod bonum ordinatur: ut per philosophum patet, in XI metaphysicae. Primum autem agens propter finem oportet esse agens per intellectum et voluntatem: ea enim quae intellectu carent, agunt propter finem sicut in finem ab alio directa. Quod quidem in artificialibus patet: nam sagittae motus est ad determinatum signum ex directione sagittantis. Simile autem esse oportet et in naturalibus. Ad hoc enim quod aliquid directe in finem debitum ordinetur, requiritur cognitio ipsius finis, et eius quod est ad finem, et debitae proportionis inter utrumque: quod solum intelligentis est. Cum igitur Deus sit primum agens, non agit per necessitatem naturae, sed intellectum et voluntatem.” George of Trebizond has a very ambiguous relationship to Thomas' thought: on the one hand, he takes up Thomistic concepts and distinctions (cf. Georg. Trapez. *Comparatio* II 10, 47: “Emergit tamen atque existit ex ipso rerum ordine. Nam sicut causata tripartito scinduntur (accidentia, ex non ente hoc, ex non ente simpliciter” and cf. Thom. Aquin. *CG* II, q. 21 a. 10); on the other hand, he derives his main theses from the Franciscan tradition and on many issues takes a position that is far removed from that of Thomas (cf. Georg. Trapez. *Comparatio*, II 15, where George quotes Thomas by name and engages with the central ideas expounded in Aquinas' *De ente et essentia*).

5 Bessarion's response in *In Calumniatorem Platonis*

In his *In Calumniatorem Platonis* Bessarion underlines the incoherence of George of Trebizond,³³ who, on the one hand, had criticized the concept of nature as an instrument of God while, on the other hand, making use of the same concept in his *Comparatio* in order to show how much Aristotle is in accord with Christian doctrine. Bessarion then exposes the mistake in George's argumentation that consists in passing illegitimately from the concept of nature as instrumental cause to that of nature being created by God and in attributing to Aristotle the idea that God not only operates through nature but creates nature. The fact that Aristotle too teaches that nature is an instrumental cause confirms that Aristotle was in accord with Plato, but it does not imply that according to Aristotle God created nature:

'Επιστῆσαι δὲ δεῖ καὶ ὅπερ ἐπάγει τὴν φύσιν αἰτίαν εἶναι ὄργανικήν. ἔαυτῷ γὰρ ἀντιφάσκει τοῦτο λέγω, ὃς ἄλλοτε πρὸς Ἡσαίαν κατὰ Πλάτωνος γράφων ἐσπούδασε δεῖξαι κατ' ιδίαν δόξαν μὴ δύνασθαι εἶναι τὴν φύσιν αἰτίαν ὄργανικήν, εἴ γε τὸ μὲν ὄργανον χωριστόν ἔστι τοῦ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γινομένου. ἡ δὲ φύσις ἐνυπάρχει τοῖς πράμασιν. ἀλλ' ὑψ' ἐτέρας ἀποκρίσεως ἡμετέρας ἐπιδιορθωθεὶς μεμάθηκε τὴν ἀλήθειαν συνεις τῆς ἀσθενείας τοῦ ἰδίου σοφιστικοῦ ἐπιχειρήματος καὶ ἐκών ἄκων ἔπειται Πλάτωνι, δι πρότερον ἀπεδοκίμαζε, τοῦτο νῦν δεχόμενος καὶ εἰς βοήθειαν ἔαυτοῦ τε καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους χρώμενος. ἔστω οὖν Ἀριστοτέλη τὴν φύσιν αἰτίαν ὄργανικήν νομίζειν, εἴ γε μὴ τοῦτο μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντα τὰ τοῦ καθηγεμόνος παραδέχεται, εἰ καὶ ποτε ῥήμασι καὶ τῷ φαινομένῳ δοκεῖ τισιν ἐναντιοῦσθαι αὐτῷ. τί δὲ ἐκ τούτου ἔπειται, εἰ ἡ φύσις ἔστι τοῦ θεοῦ ὄργανον καὶ ὑπηρέτις; φαίνεται ἀλλαγή τῆς φύσεως ὕσπερ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ διὰ μέσου τοῦ σώματος, αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν φύσιν οὔτε πεποίηκεν οὔτε ποιεῖ.³⁴

One should note that George introduces nature as an instrumental cause. In saying this he contradicts himself, since when he wrote the letter to Isaiah against Plato he was eager to demonstrate that, according to his own opinion, nature cannot be an instrumental cause, because an instrument must be separate from what is brought about by it and because nature is intrinsic to the natural entities. But corrected by our reply, he learned the truth, understanding the weakness of his own sophistic demonstration, and *volens nolens* followed Plato. That which he previously refuted he now accepts and even uses it to help himself and Aristotle. Be it that Aristotle was of the opinion that nature is an instrumental cause – Aristotle was not only of this opinion but accepted many teachings of his master Plato, even though it may appear as if he contradicted him – what follows from this, if nature is an instrument of God and his servant? Aristotle would admit that God acts through nature just as the soul does by means of the body, but he would not say that God has created or creates nature.

³³ Cf. Del Soldato 2008, 76. Cf. Del Soldato 2014.

³⁴ Bess. *ICP*, lib. III, cap. 20, 17, p. 342, 5–19 Mohler.

6 Conclusions

The task of demonstrating the compatibility of Platonism with Christianity which Bessarion took upon himself was no small challenge. The present article has examined one central issue of this theoretical endeavour, namely Bessarion's treatment of the concept of nature as an instrumental cause. The preceding analysis of the arguments formulated by Bessarion, first in response to the inquiry from his close friend and associate Theodore Gazes, and then in response to the serious objections raised by his intellectual adversary George of Trebizond, has demonstrated the central role of certain Thomistic standpoints in Bessarion's arguments. In *De natura et arte* Bessarion links the Platonic, i. e. the Neoplatonic conception of nature as an instrumental cause and by-cause that serves the demiurgic Intellect with the Thomistic doctrine of nature as *instrumentum dei*. In this way, he makes two traditions, the Byzantine and the Latin, converge in his argument and succeeds in demonstrating the fundamental harmony between Platonism and Christianity.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abbreviations

<i>NA</i>	Bessarion, <i>De natura et arte</i>
<i>ICP</i>	Bessarion, <i>In Calumniatorem Platonis</i>

Primary Sources

Aristoteles, *Ethica Nicomachea*, ed. I. Bywater. Oxford 1962.

Bessarion, *Über Natur und Kunst – De natura et arte*, neu ediert, übersetzt und mit einer Einleitung und Kommentar herausgegeben von S. Mariev, M. Marchetto, K. Luchner, Hamburg 2015.

Bessarion, *In calumniatorem Platonis. Libri IV*, hrsg. v. L. Mohler, in *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann*, Bd. 2, Paderborn 1927, Neudruck: Aalen/Paderborn 1967.

Bessarion, *Libellus: Quod natura consulto agat*, ed. L. Mohler, in *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann*, Bd. 3, Paderborn 1942, Neudruck: Aalen/Paderborn 1967, 88–90.

Georgius Trapezuntius, *Comparatio Philosophorum Platonis et Aristotelis*, ed. by J. Monfasani, in preparation.

Ioannes Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Physicorum libros tres priores Commentaria*, ed. H. Vitelli. Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, vol. XVI. Berlin 1887.

Proclus Diadochus, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, 3 Bde., ed. E. Diehl. Leipzig 1903–1906.

Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Quattuor Priores Commentaria*, ed. H. Diels. Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, IX. Berlin 1882.

Themistius, *In Aristotelis Physica Paraphrasis*, ed. H. Schenkl. Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, vol. V, pars II. Berlin 1900.

Secondary Sources

Athanasiopoulos, P. C. (2017c). "Ways of Reception of Thomas Graecus and Thomas Latinus in Bessarion's Writings". In: *Bessarion's Treasure*. Ed. by S. Mariev. Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica 3. Forthcoming.

Bianca, C. (1999). "Gaza, Teodoro". In: *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*. Vol. 52. Roma, pp. 737–746.

Del Soldato, E. (2008). "Platone, Aristotele e il Cardinale: il *De natura et arte* di Bessarione". In: *Rinascimento* 48, pp. 61–79.

Del Soldato, E. (2014). "Introduzione". In: *Basilio Bessarione: Contro il calunniatore di Platone*. Ed. by E. Del Soldato. Roma, pp. IX–XXV.

Golitsis, P. (2008). *Les Commentaires de Simplicius et de Jean Philopon à la Physique d'Aristote*. Berlin and New York.

Hankins, J. (1990). "Bessarion's Debt to Proclus in Book II of the Calumniator". In: *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*. Vol. 2. Leiden and New York, pp. 441–444.

Karamanolis, G. (2002a). "Plethon and Scholarios on Aristotle". In: *Byzantine Philosophy and Its Ancient Sources*. Ed. by K. Ierodiakonou. Oxford, pp. 253–282.

Lernould, A. (2012). "Nature in Proclus. From Irrational Immanent Principle to Goddess". In: *Neoplatonism and the Philosophy of Nature*. Ed. by J. Wilberding and C. Horn. Oxford, pp. 68–102.

Macé, C., C. Steel, and P. D'Hoine (2009). "Bessarion lecteur du Commentaire de Proclus sur le Parménide. Avec une édition de ses scholies aux livres II et III". In: *Byzantion* 79, pp. 240–279.

Marchetto, M. (2015). "Nature and Deliberation in Bessarion's 'De natura et arte'". In: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 108.2, pp. 1–18.

Mariev, S. (2013). "Der Traktat *De natura et arte* des Kardinals Bessarion". In: "Inter graecos latinissimus, inter latinos graecissimus": *Bessarion zwischen den Kulturen*. Ed. by C. Märtl, C. Kaiser, and T. Ricklin. Berlin and Boston, pp. 361–389.

Mariev, S. (2014a). "Plethon and Scholarios on Deliberation in Art and Nature". In: *Georgios Gemistos Plethon: the Byzantine and the Latin Renaissance*. Ed. by J. Matula and P. R. Blum. Olomouc, pp. 113–142.

Mariev, S., M. Marchetto, and K. Luchner (2015). "Einleitung". In: *Bessarion*, Über Natur und Kunst -- De natura et arte. Ed. by S. Mariev, M. Marchetto, and K. Luchner. Hamburg, pp. IX–LXII.

Martijn, M. (2010). *Proclus on Nature. Philosophy of Nature and Its Methods in Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*. Leiden and Boston.

Mioni, E. (1981c). *Bibliotheca Divi Marci Venetiarum codices graeci manuscripti. Volumen I: Thesaurus Antiquus. Codices 1–299*. Ministero per i beni culturali e ambientali. Indici e Cataloghi, Nuova Serie VI. Roma.

Monfasani, J. (1994). "Bessarion's Οτι ἡ φύσις βουλεύεται (Quod Natura Consulto Agat) in MS Vat. Gr. 1720". In: *Bessarione e l'Umanesimo*. Ed. by G. Fiaccadori. Napoli, pp. 323–324.

Monfasani, J. (2002b). "Theodore Gaza as a Philosopher: A Preliminary Survey". In: *Manuele Crisolora e il ritorno del greco in Occidente*. Ed. by R. Maisano and A. Rollo. Napoli, pp. 269–281.

Monfasani, J. (2011a). *Bessarion Scholasticus: A Study of Cardinal Bessarion's Latin Library*. Turnout.

Monfasani, J. (2012). "Cardinal Bessarion Greek and Latin Sources". In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinrücke. Berlin and Boston, pp. 469–480.

Rigo, A. (1994). "Le opere d'argomento teologico del giovane Bessarione". In: *Bessarione e l'Umanesimo. Catalogo della mostra*. Ed. by G. Fiaccadori. Napoli, pp. 33–46.

Rigo, A. (2012). "La teologia di Bessarione da Costantinopoli a Roma". In: *Bessarione e la sua Accademia*. Ed. by A. Gutkowski and E. Prinzivalli. Roma, pp. 21–55.

Tambrun-Krasker, B. (2013). "Bessarion, de Trébizonde à Mistra: un parcours intellectuel". In: "*Inter graecos latinissimus, inter latinos graecissimus*": *Bessarion zwischen den Kulturen*. Ed. by C. Märkl, C. Kaiser, and T. Ricklin. Berlin and Boston, pp. 1–35.

Todt, K.-P. (2006). "In Calumniatorem Platonis: Kardinal Johannes Bessarion (ca. 1403–1472) als Vermittler und Verteidiger der Philosophie Platons". In: *Der Beitrag der byzantinischen Gelehrten zur abendländischen Renaissance des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts*. Ed. by E. Konstantinou. Frankfurt a. M., pp. 149–168.

Tikhon Alexander Pino

Hylomorphism East and West

Thomas Aquinas and Mark of Ephesos on the Body-Soul Relationship

Introduction

The relationship between the material body and the immaterial soul formed a central concern of both medieval Scholasticism and late Byzantine theology. Indebted to many of the same philosophical sources, and to the writings of the Church Fathers, East and West shared a common interest in questions relating to the ensoulment of the human person, the middle state of the soul after death, and the resurrection of the body. In approaching these issues, both Greeks and Latins had recourse to the Aristotelian definition of the soul as the *form* of the body, which in turn constitutes the *matter* of the living human being understood as a substance.¹ This theory, known as hylomorphism, or entelechism, would have as its most famous expositor none other than Thomas Aquinas. Thomas would synthesize Aristotelian psychology with the broader Christian understanding of the soul to produce one of the most well-known formulations of psychosomatic unity and interdependence, defining the soul as the substantial form of the body.

The influence of Thomas Aquinas on late Byzantine thought has received increasing recognition.² Indeed, the *corpus Thomisticum graece* constitutes an important theological monument of the Palaiologan era. For this reason, it must be asked whether the appearance in Byzantium of hylomorphic formulations of the body-soul relationship are not due to the direct influence of Aquinas's writings rather than to the shared philosophical heritage of East and West.

I am grateful to Dr. Mark Johnson of Marquette University for sharing his insights into the thought of Thomas Aquinas, and for his feedback and encouragement on an earlier draft of this paper. All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

¹ See *De anima* 2, 1, 412a15–413a10, ed. W. Biehl, Leipzig 1896 (in LCL 288, Cambridge, Mass. 1957, pp. 68–72).

² See, especially, Papadopoulos 1967a; Fyrigos 2004a, 27–72; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2012d; Plested 2012e, 63–134.

Among the Greek writers who adopt a hylomorphic account of the human person is Mark Eugenikos, one of the most important theological voices at the twilight of the Byzantine Empire. Mark, who is best known for his opposition as Metropolitan of Ephesus to the Council of Florence, adopts a hylomorphic theory of psychomatic unity in his early, ostensibly anti-Plethonic treatise *On the Resurrection*.³ This apology for the goodness of human corporeality contains a definition of the soul as the εἴδος of the body, which in turn constitutes the ψύχη of the human composite. The possibility of direct dependence on Thomas has already been noted by Demetracopoulos.⁴ Yet the details of Mark's hylomorphic anthropology have not been the subject of sustained scholarly examination. This paper will therefore examine whether, and to what extent, the *De resurrectione* of Eugenikos actually relies on Aquinas for its conception of the body-soul relationship.

Points of Contact

Mark's treatise is directed at those who flatly deny the resurrection of the flesh. To the extent that the “simple and unadorned faith in the meaning of this doctrine”⁵ is insufficient for some in his own day, Mark sets out, in the spirit of the best scholastic theology, to prove this basic tenet of faith with reason and proofs.⁶ The twin errors that he seeks to combat are both associated with the “Greeks,” namely reductive materialism and Platonic disdain for the body.

For this, I think, is what eluded the wise men of the Greeks, making them ignorant. It darkened their ideas concerning the soul and made them to err. For looking to universal principles, and seeking in everything what is natural, some were ignorant of God. These are those who said that the soul is in no way separable but is immediately dissolved into non-being at death, since they deny that other forms, as well, are separable.⁷ But there are others who posited that forms are separable and subsist of themselves; and these conceded that the soul is immortal.⁸

³ The anti-Plethonic character of the work is not overt, but is inferred from several of the arguments for a bodily resurrection; see Schmemann 1951, 62; Pilavakis 1987b, 79.

⁴ J. A. Demetracopoulos 2011a, 369, n. 327.

⁵ *De resurrectione*, ed. A. Schmemann, p. 53, 16–18. A better, critical edition of this text is still needed and has in fact been announced by the project *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus*.

⁶ *De resurrectione*, pp. 53–54, 23–29 Schmemann.

⁷ This characterization may be read as a classic condemnation of Aristotelianism. Aristotle's name was long associated with precisely this type of materialism (see Gregory of Nyssa, *De anima et resurrectione*, ed. A. Spira, Leiden 2014, p. 33, 18 – p. 34, 2; Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration 27*, 10. Aquinas acknowledges this patrimony, though he clearly disagrees with it; see SG 2, 79, 1610). By the late Byzantine period, though, “Aristotelianism” gradually lost its pejorative connotation and was eventually recast as a system compatible with Christianity, particularly in the battle with Plethon's Platonism (cf. J. A. Demetracopoulos 2011a, 367).

⁸ *De resurrectione*, p. 55, 88–95 Schmemann.

To this “irrationality,” Mark opposes the Christian understanding of the person.

The rational and intellective soul, created according to the image of God and separable from its kindred matter ...when it is uncoupled from that to which it is yoked, advances to the things that are akin to it and attains a condition appropriate to itself.⁹

The points of contact between the anthropology, and even the methodology, of Mark and Thomas are obvious enough. As already noted, Mark appears to follow Thomas, not only in supplying a rational defense of the resurrection, but especially in identifying the human body as the matter of the human substance, whose soul constitutes its form (*λόγον εἴδους ἐπέχειν πρὸς ὑλὴν τὸ σῶμα*).¹⁰ Both Mark and Thomas are also insistent that the human person is essentially composite (*τὴν οὐσίαν ἔχομεν συνεστῶσαν*).¹¹ For this reason, even though the soul has its own operation,¹² the soul alone is not understood, in Platonic fashion, to constitute the individual human being. *Homo non est anima tantum, sed est aliquid compositum ex anima et corpore. Plato vero, ponens sentire esse proprium animae, ponere potuit quod homo esset anima utens corpore.*¹³ For Mark, then, even though the soul is “released” to a more authentic life after death, this does not mean that death is some kind of liberation from corporeality.

For it is uncoupled from the body and is freed from its passions, but it is in no way unyoked from its natural relation towards it. For even when it is flying away, it yet directs its gaze towards its kindred dwelling-place, even though the latter has been dissolved into its constituent elements.¹⁴

⁹ *De resurrectione*, p. 56, 102–105 Schmemann.

¹⁰ *De resurrectione*, p. 55, 77 Schmemann; cf. p. 54, 35–38 Schmemann. See, also, ST Ia, q. 76, a. 1, resp.: “It is clear that the first thing whereby the body lives is the soul. And since life is manifested through different operations in different degrees of living things, that whereby we first of all perform each of these activities is the soul. For the soul is the first thing whereby we are nourished, whereby we sense, and whereby we execute locomotion. And in the same way it is that whereby we first of all understand. This principle, then, whereby we first of all understand, whether it is called intellect or intellective soul, is the form of the body. And this is the demonstration of Aristotle in *De Anima*, book 2.” Cf. SG 2, 68.

¹¹ *De resurrectione*, p. 54, 46–48 Schmemann. See *Sentencia libri De Anima* 197–223; cf. SG 2, 57, 1326; *De potentia* q. 3, a. 9, arg. 2.

¹² *Habet operationem per se* (ST Ia, q. 75, a. 2, resp.). Cf. Eugenikos: καθ' αὐτὴν διάγει (*De resurrectione*, p. 56, 107–108 Schmemann).

¹³ ST Ia, q. 75, a. 4, resp.; cf. SG 2, 57. This is most famously espoused in the *Commentary on 1 Corinthians* 15, 2, 924: *Anima mea non est ego* (ed. R. Cai, Turin 1953, vol. 2, p. 411). See, also, ST Ia, q. 76, a. 1, ad 5: “The existence of the whole composite is also the existence of the soul itself (*quod illud esse quod est totius compositi, est etiam ipsius animae*);” and ST IIa IIae, q. 83, a. 11, obj. 5. Cf., also, Eugenikos: “Neither the soul by itself nor the body, but both together are deserving of the name ‘man’” (*De resurrectione*, p. 55, 71–72 Schmemann).

¹⁴ *De resurrectione*, p. 56, 115–118 Schmemann.

For both Eugenikos and Aquinas, this enduring connection between the soul and body is the basis for the resurrection, since the soul possesses a teleological longing for the body. Body itself thus becomes a permanent mark of the soul so that the resurrection of the flesh becomes a necessity. Without resurrection, the human person would remain forever incomplete after the dissolution of death.¹⁵ “He would be not-man rather than man.”¹⁶ Whereas Mark will speak of this relationship as a “bond,” Thomas speaks of an *aptitudo* and *inclinatio*:

To be united to the body belongs (*convenit*) to the soul in accordance with itself, just as it belongs to a light body in accordance with itself to be lifted up. And just as a light body remains light even though it has been separated from its proper place—albeit with an aptitude and inclination toward its proper place—in the same way the human soul remains in its own existence when it has been separated from the body, having a natural aptitude and inclination towards union with the body.¹⁷

This is because the soul, even though it “exists in the body as a subsistent thing,” does not possess “the perfection (*completio*) of its nature, which it has in union with the body.”¹⁸ On this, Mark and Thomas are in agreement.

Separation

As already noted, this consonance between Aquinas and Eugenikos is suggestive, especially given the availability of the two *Summae* in Byzantium. But these basic similarities quickly give way to important divergences, centering especially on the problem of soul’s separability from body. Mark, as we have seen, puts the separability of forms at the heart of Greek errors concerning the soul. He himself is confident that forms are not generally separable from matter.¹⁹ Nevertheless, due to his Christian belief in the afterlife of the soul, Mark must explain how, after death, the human *eidos* is able to exist without its matter. Mark’s position is that this is not due to any inherent, natural feature of souls *qua* form, but rather to “the power of God, which brought them forth

¹⁵ For the metaphysical problems that this creates for Aquinas, and possible resolutions, see Brower 2014, 279–310; Nevitt 2014, 1–19. I am grateful to Dr. Nicholas Kahm for sharing his insights, along with many resources, on Thomistic anthropology.

¹⁶ *De resurrectione*, p. 55, 72–76 Schmemann.

¹⁷ ST Ia, q. 76, a. 1, ad 6. Cf. *De potentia* q. 3, a. 10, arg. 4.

¹⁸ *De potentia* q. 3, a. 10, ad. 16. Cf. *Sentencia libri De anima* 215: Soul “does not have a complete species, but rather is part of a species.”

¹⁹ This is consistent with the idea that Mark is, philosophically, an Aristotelian (see J. A. Demetra-copoulos 2011a, 367). Cf. *De anima* 2, 1(413a 4): οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ψυχὴ χωριστὴ τοῦ σώματος. “It is perfectly clear that neither the soul, nor any of its parts (if it should have them), is separable. For sometimes the entelechy belongs to the very parts” (413a 4–8; LCL 288:72).

out of non-being.”²⁰ The immortality of the soul is thus an exception to metaphysical norms; indeed, it is something of a miracle.

This stands in obvious contrast to Aquinas, who develops a sophisticated theory of subsistent forms to account for what he sees as the natural immortality of the soul after death.²¹ In describing the rational soul Aquinas will even refer to the intellect as a substance.²² Thomas’s understanding derives from his reading of Aristotle, whose psychology as laid out in the *De anima* appears to equivocate on the absolute separability of soul. Though the soul, *qua* entelechy, perishes together with the body, Aristotle also holds that, “nothing prevents some parts [of soul] from being separated from body, since they are not the entelechies of any body.”²³ This is applied especially to the intellect, since for Aristotle, “intellect seems to subsist as a kind of substance, perishing not.”²⁴ On the basis of these passages, Thomas is able to hold that the soul transcends its role as informing principle. Indeed, it has a dimension which is independent of body (*virtus intellectiva non est corporis actus*).²⁵ This not only accounts for the inner life of man, allowing him to think and know, but it explains the subsistence of the soul even when separated from the body. Unlike other forms, *quae non sunt subsistentes*, the human soul thus remains *in suo esse*, even when the body, its matter, has been destroyed.²⁶ This basic argument for the immortality of the soul differs from that of Eugenikos, for whom the sundering of body and soul is an unnatural event requiring the intervention of God.

20 *De resurrectione*, p. 55, 80–81 Schmemann.

21 See, e.g., SG 2.51, where subsistent forms are distinguished from immanent, or material forms. Cf. SG 2, 79–81; and see Kretzmann 1999, 403–418.

22 See, e.g., SG 2, 56; 68–69; 77, 90; *De potentia* q. 3, a. 10, arg. 11. Cf. Bazán 1997, 95–126.

23 *De Anima* 2, 1 (413a 7–8). Cf. *Sentencia libri De anima* 242, 677–699.

24 *De Anima* 1, 4 (408b 19–20). Cf. 3, 4 (429a 11–12); 1, 1 (403a 11–13); 3, 5 (439a 15–25). “This intellect is separable, impassible, and unmixed, being in essence an activity.... It alone is, when separated, what it is, and it alone is immortal and eternal ...and without this there is no thought.” Whether this “intellect” is the same as the human soul is not clear from the text of the *De anima* itself: “Concerning the intellect and the faculty of contemplation, it is as yet unclear. It seems to be another kind (γένος ἔτερον) of soul. And this alone admits of separation, as immortality from corruptibility” (*De anima* 2, 2, 413b 25–28). Cf. Plotinus, *Enneads* 4, 7, 8(5), ed. Henry and Schwyzler, Brussels 1959, p. 210, 15–16.

25 ST Ia, q. 76, a. 1, ad 1; cf. ad 4. See, also, SG 2, 61; 68–70; *De potentia* q. 3, a. 9, arg. 1.

26 Again, this is by virtue of the fact that the human being is essentially a composite. ST Ia, q. 76, a. 1, ad 5: *Anima illud esse in quo ipsa subsistit, communicat materiae corporali, ex qua et anima intellectiva fit unum, ita quod illud esse quod est totius compositi, est etiam ipsius animae. Quod non accidit in aliis formis, quae non sunt subsistentes. Et propter hoc anima humana remanet in suo esse, destructo corpore, non autem aliae formae.*

Light the Form of the Sun

To illustrate the supernatural character of the soul's separability, Mark draws an analogy with the sun, whose *eidos*, following an important passage from St. Gregory Nazianzen's forty-fourth *Oration*, he identifies as the sun's light. "For light," Gregory had authoritatively, if somewhat cryptically, stated, "is the form of the sun."²⁷ This statement forms the basis of Mark's belief about the soul.

But if it seems strange to anyone to say that the soul is to the body what form is to matter—since we do not allow, as those who think this way, that forms are separable from matter—we respond thus. Forms by their proper nature are inseparable from substrates, since they are divisible only in thought. But by the power of God, who brought them out of non-being, they are nonetheless quite capable of being separated. For we know that the light, which from the beginning was the form of the sun, existed *before* the sun,²⁸ having been created by itself; and we believe that later it will be separated once more from the fiery substance and bestowed as a habitation upon the blessed. What, then, is so wonderful if we posit also in the case of the soul that from the beginning it was created *together* with its substrate, as its form, just as light is the form of the sun?²⁹

Mark's language here (τί οὖν θαυμαστόν;) reinforces the fact that for both his own metaphysics and that of Gregory, this is a miraculous (but not impossible) occurrence, since neither light nor the soul are independent substances. For Gregory, God had created the form before the matter "that he might work a still great wonder (ἴνα θαυματουργήζη τι μεῖζον)," and demonstrate his power by bringing into being what ordinarily exists only in combination with something else.³⁰ This power, for Mark, is what allows the soul to exist after death, and its supernatural character is precisely what foiled the wisdom of the Greeks.³¹

But the principle that "light is the form of the sun," though taken authoritatively from the writings of St. Gregory Nazianzen, is difficult to reconcile with Thomistic and Aristotelian metaphysics. Though Gregory had made this statement specifically in reference to the hylomorphic character of creatures, it would prove a difficult, if persistent, axiom of patristic ontology. In a testament to the authority of the Cappadocian Father whom the Byzantines called "the Theologian," this definition was to have enduring value. The reception of this peculiar formula was not limited to the East, and Aquinas's work engages its legacy in the Latin world. *Alii vero dixerunt quod lux est*

²⁷ *Oration* 44, 4 (PG 36:611–612): "For while in the case of other creatures he brought matter into being first and created form later..., in this case—in order to work a still greater wonder—he caused the form to exist before the matter (for light is the form of the sun)."

²⁸ Genesis 1:3–5, 14–18. Cf. Gregory Palamas, *Homilies* 35, 5.

²⁹ *De resurrectione*, p. 55, 76–86 Schmemann.

³⁰ *Oration* 44, 4 (PG 36:611–612). Cf. *Poemata arcana* 4, 7–8, ed. C. Moreschini, Oxford 1997, p. 16.

³¹ In Mark's treatise, the statements concerning Greek errors on the soul follow directly upon his rationale for the miraculous separability of souls.

forma substantialis solis.³² This is perhaps a reference to Bonaventure, who had affirmed, like Mark, that light was the substantial form of the sun in his *Commentary on the Sentences*.³³ Robert Grosseteste espouses the same principle in his *De luce*, where he constructs an entire metaphysics of light as form.³⁴ But for Aquinas, this conception of form had nothing to do with traditional Aristotelian hylomorphism, for which form constitutes a thing's species or actuality, intelligible to the mind but not perceivable by the senses in and of themselves. *Nulla forma substantialis est per se sensibilis, sed solo intellectu comprehensibilis*. Instead, for Thomas, light is an “active quality” of the sun.³⁵ Consequently, for Thomas, the creation of the sun was substantially complete on the first day, even if it received greater refinement on the fourth.³⁶

There are, then, deeper differences between Eugenikos and Aquinas than appear at first sight. But it would be a mistake to stop at these differences and claim that there is no relationship between the thought of Thomas and Mark on the body-soul relationship. It is true that a strong *dependence* on Thomistic anthropology has not so far been found in the *De resurrectione*.³⁷ But another remarkable fact has emerged. Though our Greek and Latin authors differ as to their understanding of the separability of the soul, the two authors are nevertheless seen to participate in a kind of dialogue. Not only do they debate the soul's natural immortality and separability, but an influential phrase from the Church Fathers is negotiated in each of their writings. To put it more precisely, Mark Eugenikos, even in departing from Aquinas, is seen to participate in a broader Scholastic conversation concerning form—a conversation taking place between Thomas and Bonaventure as well as Robert Grosseteste. To this extent, scholastic discourse can be seen to extend beyond the Latin world, involving both East and West in a debate that has hitherto been thought of as exclusively Western in scope.

Angelic Hylomorphism

Further exploration of the *De resurrectione* reveals still more points of contact, which transcend direct influence and show, instead, a deeper synchronism and sympathy

³² ST Ia, q. 67, a. 3, resp.

³³ See *Commentary on the Sentences* II, d. 13, esp. a. 2, q. 2.

³⁴ Ed. Panti, Toronto 2013, pp. 193–238.

³⁵ *Sentencia libri De anima* 420. Cf. ST Ia, q. 67, a. 3, obj. 3 and resp.

³⁶ *De potentia* q. 4, a. 2, s.c. 6–10 and resp.; *De potentia*, continuatio Vicentii de Castronovo, ad s.c. 6–10.

³⁷ Philosophical divergences do not, however, rule out *all* dependence. As Demetracopoulos has shown, Mark's knowledge of Aquinas is at times easily detectable at the textual level (see J. A. Demetracopoulos 2011a, 342–368).

between East and West.³⁸ An important example is found in Mark's discussion of angelic hylomorphism, which forms his first argument for the necessity of a human resurrection. Mark's logic is founded on the notion that only God is simple. All creatures, even angels, admit of synthesis, even if they are incorporeal.³⁹

The things created by God admit of composition by reason of their distance from him, since they miss the mark of simplicity. And their lack of simplicity is filled by a kind of matter, subsisting with its own form. In us human beings, and in the irrational and soulless essences under us, this is called body. But in angels, since they both are and are called incorporeal, it is not body; but a material distinction is nevertheless observed even in them, whereby we distinguish, in thought alone, their substrate and the form that is contemplated as if above it.⁴⁰

For Mark, the fact that angels are composite, coupled with the fact that human composition is born of corporeality, means that the resurrection is a common-sense fact of nature. Soul needs to be reunited with body in order to restore the proper order of things. A human being without a body, in other words, is simple, and do we really expect to be simpler even than the angels?⁴¹

Here again, Eugenikos is shown to disagree quite clearly with Aquinas, since Thomas is a firm advocate of the absolute immateriality of angels. To the question whether "angels are composed of matter and form," Thomas answers an unequivocal "no": *impossibile est quod substantia intellectualis habeat qualemcumque materiam*.⁴² To distinguish the angels from God, Thomas does not resort to hylomorphic theory, but rather to the fact that angels possess act and potency. In this way, Thomas is able to distinguish the absolute simplicity of God, which like Mark he is eager to preserve, from the composite character of creatures.

38 Cf. Louth 2005, 57–58; Louth 2007, 6–7.

39 This is, of course, an ancient notion; cf. Verbeke 1945. Mark's explicit dependence on patristic authority for this argument is discussed further below.

40 *De resurrectione*, p. 54, 34–40 Schmemann. But cf. the letter *To Theodosios*, where Mark asserts that "no matter whatsoever intervenes" in the angelic apprehension of God (ed. Pilavakis, pp. 304–05). (I am grateful to Christiaan Kappes for bringing this and other related passages to my attention, and for his helpful comments on a first draft of this paper.)

41 Ανθρώπους δὲ ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγονότας συνθέτους, εἴτα ἀπλουστέρους ἀποδεδεῖχθαι καὶ τῶν ἄγγελων, εἴ γε διαλυθέντων, ὄνκετι τοῖς ίδιοις σώμασιν αἱ ψυχαὶ συναφθείεν (*De resurrectione* pp. 54–55, 60–62 Schmemann). Cf. Eugenikos, *Oratio prima de igne purgatorio* 14.8, and Bessarion's *Responsio graecorum* 19.8 (ed. Petit, Paris 1927, pp. 59, 78), where Mark and the Orthodox delegation note that it is their material substrate that will allow the demons to be burned by hellfire (Mt 25:41), whereas the disembodied soul, as a form lacking its matter, cannot be burned (i. e., in purgatory) prior to the resurrection.

42 ST Ia, q. 50, a. 2, resp. Cf. SG 2, 50, 1260: "For everything composed out of matter and form is body."

Thus if matter is not involved, and supposing that the form itself subsists not-in-matter, there still remains the relation (*comparatio*) of form to its very existence (*esse*), as potentiality to act. And such is the composition to be understood in angels.⁴³

But even in spite of this disagreement, here, once more, Mark is seen to participate in a broader Scholastic conversation. For the very notion that angels were composed of both form and matter, as is obvious from Aquinas's treatment, was a deeply contested issue in the West. It was the doctrine of Alexander of Hales,⁴⁴ and as such entered the thought of Bonaventure.⁴⁵ Mark's arguments, to an extent, mirror the perspective of these figures, even if he does not, in the *De resurrectione*, develop them with the same level of philosophical sophistication. For this reason, Mark's hylomorphism is able to be placed in conversation with Aquinas, on the opposite side of an important Scholastic debate.

As with the inheritance of Gregory's forty-fourth *Oration*, this confluence is certainly due to the common patrimony of East and West, who were often reading the same Church Fathers. In defending his claim that even angels admit of a material substrate, Mark cites the influential writings of St. John of Damaskos.

For God alone is absolutely simple and immaterial, and neither composition nor division are in any way conceived in him. And many different saints testify to this, including the theologian of Damaskos, in his *Theological Chapters*.⁴⁶

This is, of course, a reference to the *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, where St. John outlines his famous conception of relative materiality. According to St. John, an angel, "is called bodiless and immaterial in regard to us. But when compared with God, who alone is incomparable, everything appears dense and material, for only the divine is truly immaterial and bodiless."⁴⁷ John's argument, that angels are circumscribed (*περιγραπτοί*) by place, is thus replicated by Eugenikos, who notes that "the great Paul has said that they are sent to minister (Heb 1:14), attaining different places at different times."⁴⁸

⁴³ ST Ia, q. 50, a. 2, ad 3. Cf. SG 2, 52, 1273: "One should not think, even though intellectual substances are not corporeal, nor composed (*compositae*) out of matter and form... that they are therefore equal to the divine simplicity. For a certain composition is found in them since in them existence is not the same as 'what it is';" see, also, SG 2, 53–54.

⁴⁴ See Colish 1995, 106–109; Lottin 1932, 21–39.

⁴⁵ See *Commentary on the Sentences* II, d. 3, esp. a. 1. On the position of John Duns Scotus, see Sullivan 2010, 397–427.

⁴⁶ *De resurrectione*, p. 54, 43–46 Schmemann.

⁴⁷ St. John of Damaskos, *Exact Exposition* 2, 3 (ed. Kotter, Berlin 1973 p. 45).

⁴⁸ *De resurrectione*, p. 54, 42–43 Schmemann. Cf. *Exact Exposition* 2, 3: "Angels are circumscribed, for when they are in heaven, they are not on earth, and when they are sent by God to earth, they do not remain in heaven.... And they cannot be present and active in two places at once" (p. 46, Kotter).

These arguments are not unknown to Thomas, and he engages them directly within his own treatment of angels. *Damascenus dicit, in libro II, quod angelus incorporeus et immaterialis dicitur quantum ad nos, sed comparatus ad Deum, corporeus et materialis invenitur.*⁴⁹ For Thomas, though, this does not mean that angels possess actual matter. For him relative materiality is not simply relative, it is subjective. *Deo comparati* they are material and corporeal, but they do not really possess matter. It only seems so (*videtur*), just as what is tepid appears cold when compared to what is actually warm.⁵⁰ Similarly, though the angels are circumscribed, “to be circumscribed by spatial limits is proper to bodies; whereas to be circumscribed by essential limits is common to all creatures, spiritual as well as corporeal.”⁵¹ For Aquinas, therefore, the angel is pure form and *omnino incorporeus*,⁵² since “an angel and a body are said to occupy space in different senses (*aequivoce*).”⁵³ For this reason Thomas can accept that angels are operative in a specific place without for that reason accepting that they are circumscribed materially.⁵⁴ In this way, Thomas and Mark once again fall on opposite sides of a Scholastic debate, but it is a debate nonetheless, and there is no hint that the two thinkers are approaching the subject with methodologies that are fundamentally opposed or incompatible.

Consistent with this observation, the angelology of Eugenikos and Aquinas reflects even further thematic parallels. As intimated above, Mark evinces a marked concern that, ultimately, angels emerge simpler in essence than the human being.⁵⁵ For Thomas, too, the differentiation of the soul from the angels *qua* spirit was an important element in the elaboration of a hylomorphic anthropology.⁵⁶ Like Mark, Thomas recognized that the disembodied state evoked the bodiless condition of the angels,⁵⁷ and he was eager to distinguish the ontological condition of the soul from that of angels. In his examination into “whether the soul is of a species identical with the angels,”⁵⁸ Aquinas claims that this was in fact the position of Origen.⁵⁹ For Aquinas, this is the reason that angels must be pure spirit, since their immateriality ensures that they possess a principle of differentiation, not only from souls, but from one another. But when pressed further, Thomas will add that the soul differs from an angel also by the fact

⁴⁹ ST Ia, q. 50, a. 1, obj. 1.

⁵⁰ ST Ia, q. 50, a. 1, ad 1.

⁵¹ ST Ia, q. 50, a. 1, ad 3.

⁵² ST Ia, q. 50, a. 1, obj. 1. Cf. ST Ia, q. 50, a. 2, resp.: *omnis substantia intellectualis est omnino immaterialis*.

⁵³ ST Ia, q. 50, a. 2, resp.

⁵⁴ Cf. ST Ia, q. 50, a. 1, ad 3.

⁵⁵ See n. 41 above.

⁵⁶ Cf, e.g., Bonaventure, *Commentary on the Sentences* 2, d. 1, pars 2, a. 3; Alexander of Hales, *Summa* 2, q. 20, m. 5.

⁵⁷ Cf. *De potentia* q. 3, a. 10, arg. 8.

⁵⁸ Ia, q. 75, proem.

⁵⁹ Ia, q. 75, a. 7, resp.

that it is the *form* of a certain matter (*materiae alicuius*).⁶⁰ As already intimated, this difference is rooted in the notion that “an angel is a nature complete in itself,” while soul carries with itself a perennial relation to body.⁶¹

Despite their differences, then, both thinkers approach the subject of angels within the same frame of reference, and with a common appreciation for the problems involved in the middle state of souls. In discussing angelic matter, their conversation continues as if engaged in a *disputatio*. Not only do they disagree about the hylomorphic character of angels, they are also seen to dispute the proper interpretation of St. John of Damaskos, and the sense in which “place” can be attributed to angels. But even in their disagreement, the two authors evince similar ways of thinking, which show their respective theories to be compatible in genre and method, even if one is not found to be the source of the other.

Identity

A final example of this trend can be found in Eugenikos’s doctrine of bodily identity, which is a corollary of his strict entelechism. As we saw earlier, for Mark a soul without a body is not fully human.

How, then, will this human being, namely that which is composed of soul and body—who from the beginning was created in immortality, but was punished for his transgression and restored again by grace to his original dignity—how will he cast away that with which he was bequeathed immortality? In that case he would be not-man rather than man.⁶²

For this reason, Mark holds that the body does not disappear after death, but abides mysteriously, awaiting the resurrection, when it will be united once more with the soul that likewise longs to inhabit its former habitation.⁶³ Following St. Paul (1 Cor 15:37), Eugenikos likens this mystery to that of the grain, which also decomposes in hope of another, transformed life, but without being altogether lost.⁶⁴ Between the corrupted seed planted in the ground and the final product lies a “middle” analogous to the “invisible bond” between body and soul.

The blade which sprouts up intervenes between the decomposed seed and the grain that will be brought to completion when it ripens. And until then it endures as a kind of bond between the two until what has rotted is renewed and appears, more magnificent, all over again. And this relation is analogous to the bond between soul and body, with the difference that, in the case of

⁶⁰ Ia, q. 76, a. 2, ad 1.

⁶¹ *De potentia* q. 3, a. 10, ad 10.

⁶² *De resurrectione*, p. 55, 72–76 Schmemann.

⁶³ Cf. n. 14 above.

⁶⁴ Cf. Bynum 1995, 1–18.

the seed and the grain, both terms are sensible: the point whence nature had its beginning and that towards which it is impelled through intermediate states. These latter, obviously, are also sensible: the roots, the stalk, the blade around it; afterward the spikelets and the husks, and the grain that is being perfected in them little by little. But in the case of soul and body, each of the extremes is beyond sensation. That which subsists of itself will, in its own time, fashion for itself a new body, while the bond is also intelligible and beyond sensation. For this reason we tend to think that the soul is completely freed from the body, since we see neither it nor its bond with the body. Even the body itself we do not see, since it is soon dissolved into those things of which it was composed. Yet even the souls of the saints bear witness that the soul, even though existing of itself, is oriented still toward its kindred and somehow bound to it.⁶⁵

Mark's theory here is indebted primarily to his reading of St. Gregory of Nyssa and St. Maximos the Confessor, for whom the "relation" and "bond" between body and soul was permanent. In Gregory's *De anima et resurrectione* and *De opificio hominis*, upon which Mark is dependent throughout his entire treatise,⁶⁶ the Cappadocian develops a theory of the absolute correlativity of body and soul, such that their union is eternal. The soul has a natural *schesis* with the body, which is also described as a union (both a κοινωνία and a συνάρφεια),⁶⁷ affection (στοργή), and unconfused communion (κοινότης ἀσύγχυτος).⁶⁸ By virtue of the soul's unextended nature, and its transcendence of space, it is able to survive the dissolution of the body.⁶⁹ It continues to be with (παρεῖναι)⁷⁰ the body and abide with it.⁷¹ It stands by it as a guard,⁷² and continues its influence on the body.⁷³ St. Gregory even uses the language of attraction or pull, allowing Eugenikos to liken the soul's influence on body to that of a magnet on iron: invisible, and mysterious, but real.⁷⁴

For Mark, the soul's continuing presence to the body even in death is proven by the miracle-working power of relics (i. e., the corpses of the blessed), through which

⁶⁵ *De resurrectione* pp. 56–57, 122–137 Schmemann.

⁶⁶ For the image of the seed, see *De opificio hominis* 27, 29 (PG 44:228CD, 236A, 240AB); *De anima et resurrectione*, p. 117, 22 – p. 122, 17 Spira. For the notion of soul "going to its kindred," see *De Opificio hominis* 26, 27 (PG 44:162B, 224D, 225C); *De anima et resurrectione*, p. 7, 14–15; p. 28, 14–15; p. 55, 18–20; p. 57, 14–17 Spira.

⁶⁷ *De opificio hominis* (PG 44:177B).

⁶⁸ *De opificio hominis* 27 (PG 44:225B). Cf. *De anima et resurrectione*, p. 28, 2 Spira.

⁶⁹ *De anima et resurrectione*, p. 30, 12 – p. 31, 15 Spira.

⁷⁰ *De anima et resurrectione*, p. 30, 4, 19; p. 55, 19; p. 62, 5 Spira.

⁷¹ *De anima et resurrectione*, p. 31, 7 Spira. Cf. *De anima et resurrectione*: καὶ μετὰ τὴν διάλυσιν παραμένειν (p. 55, 19 Spira).

⁷² *De anima et resurrectione*, p. 55, 19–20 Spira.

⁷³ *De anima et resurrectione* p. 28, 6–10 Spira.

⁷⁴ Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἡ μάγνησσα λίθος ἀρρήτῳ φύσεως βίᾳ τὸν σίδηρον ἔλκει... ὡς τὸν μεταξὺ σχέσιν ἀόρατον οὖσαν, ... τὶ τῶν ἀτόπων εἰ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑποτιθέμεθα ... ἐφέλκεσθαι τὸ σώμα...; (*De resurrectione*, p. 57, 139–142 Schmemann). Cf. *De opificio hominis* 27 (PG 44:225C): ἐφ' ἐαυτὴν πάλιν ἐλκούσῃ... ἀρρήτῳ τινὶ τῇ τῆς φύσεως ὀλκῇ. This is related to, but distinct from, the teleological tendency of soul towards body.

the souls of the saints continue to operate.⁷⁵ All of this, ultimately, allows Mark, like Gregory, to distinguish between the soul's extrication from sinful, passionate flesh, from an absolute, Platonic liberation from corporeality, a distinction that was not unknown to Aquinas.⁷⁶ For both Gregory and Eugenikos, the release from present burdens is brought about by a renewal of the body, not its destruction.⁷⁷

Maximos the Confessor takes up Gregory's anti-Origenist arguments in his seventh and forty-second *Ambigua*, where he refutes the Origenist doctrine of the pre-existence of souls.⁷⁸ In these texts, Maximos argues for the absolute simultaneity and enduring correlativity of body and soul. Though the two have different principles and modes of origination, and are not identical in their being,⁷⁹ body and soul nevertheless constitute a single subsistence.⁸⁰ As such, their relation (*σχέσις*) is "immutable," since the loss of either "part" would logically destroy the whole.⁸¹ "It is inconceivable to speak of (and impossible to find) the soul and body except in relation to each other, since each one introduces together with itself the idea of the other to which it belongs."⁸² For this reason, Maximos can assert, against the Origenist appropriation of Platonism, that "there will be no complete and utter reduction of bodies to non-being," since this would mean the annihilation of the human person, who is essentially a composite of both.⁸³

But neither Maximos nor Gregory had formulated their anthropology in the context of a hylomorphic account of the human person.⁸⁴ Insofar as Aristotle had defined form as "the *first actuality* of a natural body potentially possessed of life,"⁸⁵ the

⁷⁵ *De resurrectione*, p. 57, 137–139 Schmemann. Cf. *De anima et resurrectione*, p. 64, 15 – p. 65, 1 Spira); Plato, *Phaedo* (81c8–d5)

⁷⁶ See *De potentia* q. 3, a. 10, ad 17: "It is the corruption of the body, and not its nature, that burdens (*aggravat*) the soul." Cf. *De opificio hominis* 12; 15; 16; 17; 18 (PG 44:157B, 161C–164D, 192A, D, 193C).

⁷⁷ *De resurrectione*, p. 57, 144–161 Schmemann. This is the basis for Mark's remarkable doctrine of spiritual bodies, wherein each member and sense, though corporeal, is reordered to spiritual realities (see *De resurrectione* pp. 58–59, 195–211 Schmemann); cf. *De anima et resurrectione* p. 77, 1–11; p. 110, 8 – p. 11, 10; p. 119, 17–19 Spira.

⁷⁸ See Stephanou 1932.

⁷⁹ *Ambiguum* 42.8, ed. N. Constas, Cambridge, Mass. 2014, vol. II, p. 136. The soul is simple and incorporeal, and is infused by God (7.39; 42.8, 10), while the body is made from previously existing matter (7.35).

⁸⁰ *Ambiguum* 42.9.

⁸¹ *Ambiguum* 7.40, 43, ed. N. Constas, Cambridge, Mass. 2014, vol I, pp. 136, 140.

⁸² *Ambiguum* 7.43, p. 141 Constas I.

⁸³ *Ambiguum* 42.16. Cf. 42.19: "We do not expect any putting off of body" (pp. 158–159 Constas II). For Maximos, therefore, material identity is formal identity.

⁸⁴ Though Maximos follows Aristotle in defining the human being as "an organic body united to a soul with intellect" (*Ambiguum* 7.39, p. 134 Constas I), and subscribes to a kind of entelechism (see 7.37, 42.21), for Maximos, in fact, body and soul are distinct οὐσίαι, which together constitute a single εἶδος (7.40, 43; 42.8, 10, 23).

⁸⁵ *De anima* 2, 1 (412a 28–30; 412b 10) (LCL 288:68).

corpse in the grave ceases to qualify as a “body.”⁸⁶ Aristotle had therefore posited the homonymy of the corpse, which, devoid of the soul, ceases to be what it formerly was, since its informing principle has been taken from it.⁸⁷ Thomas follows Aristotle in this regard and, unlike Eugenikos, takes entelechism to its logical conclusion. For Thomas, as for Aristotle, the body in the tomb is not truly a body, but only equivocably so. “Therefore, when soul departs, the body does not remain the same in species, for one does not speak of ... the flesh of a dead man except equivocally, as is made clear by the Philosopher in book seven of his *Metaphysics*.⁸⁸

Because this corpse will also decompose, Thomas’s understanding of the body accounts more consistently for the conservation of matter. Though Gregory, Maximos, and Mark all acknowledge that the body returns to the elements out of which it was composed, none seek to explain how the body retains material identity even after decomposition, insofar as these same elements will presumably be incorporated into the matter of other creatures.⁸⁹ Because Thomas maintains the formal, and not material, identity of the resurrection body, he is conversely able to say that the risen body is the *same* as what is buried only by virtue of having the same soul, i. e. the same form.⁹⁰ This contrasts starkly with the position of Mark, who contends that, just as a soul longs to be reunited with its body, “so the body, dissolved into those things out of which it was composed, awaits the time when it shall be joined to the soul.”⁹¹

These final examples, once again, serve to reveal deep points of tension in the hylomorphic theories of Thomas Aquinas and Mark Eugenikos. But we can nevertheless say with confidence that Mark is immersed in the same theological world as Aquinas. Even if Mark is not, in his *De resurrectione*, dependent upon Thomas for his own hylomorphism, yet he is deeply imbued in the problematics and foci of Latin Scholastic theology. This is due, undoubtedly, to the fact that both East and West are dealing with the same inheritance: Aristotelianism, Platonism, and the writings of such Fathers as

⁸⁶ “That which has lost its soul does not have the potential to live” (*De anima* 2, 1 [412b 26–27] [LCL 288:70]). Cf. 412a 11–12: “Bodies seem, most of all, to be substances (οὐσία)” (LCL 288:66).

⁸⁷ Cf. *De anima* 2, 1: “If the eye were a living thing, its soul would be its vision; for this is the substance (οὐσία) of the eye in the sense of its definition (λόγος). And the eye is the matter of vision. If it fails, there is no eye except by equivocation” (412b 18–22; LCL 288:70).

⁸⁸ *Sentencia libri De anima* 226; cf. *Metaphysics* 7 (1035b 24–25). “Soul is the substantial form of a living body, and when it is removed, a living body no longer remains except equivocally” (*Sentencia libri De anima* 239).

⁸⁹ For the patristic background to this discussion, especially as it deals with chain consumption, see Bynum 1995, 28–33. Gregory’s explanation was that these elements were “marked” by the soul from conception, but he makes no attempt at explaining whether these elements remain undisturbed until the general resurrection; see, esp., *De opificio hominis* 27 (PG 44:228B); *De anima et resurrectione*, p. 57, 1–14 Spira.

⁹⁰ See Stump 2006, 153–174; Bynum 1995, 229–276. Cf. n. 15 above.

⁹¹ *De resurrectione*, p. 56, 105–107 Schmemann; “awaits” here having the distinct sense of “remaining”: ἀναμένει.

John of Damaskos and Gregory of Nazianzos. But the works of Thomas Aquinas, and other Latin thinkers, would also have been available to Eugenikos, and more work remains to be done to examine the extent to which Mark's positions are consciously engaged with Scholastic debates.

Conclusion

What we find, then, when we examine the extent to which Mark, as a late Byzantine thinker, was indebted to the formulations of Thomas Aquinas, is not simply Greeks borrowing from Latins, but a Byzantine theological milieu *in conversation with* the sources and problems of Latin Scholasticism. The example of Mark's *De resurrectione* shows us that even when influence is more difficult to prove, the differences between Thomistic and Byzantine philosophy do not simply leave us with a gap between East and West. Rather, the recognition that Eugenikos has not simply borrowed the form-matter paradigm from Aquinas allows us to move beyond the question of influence to deeper points of contact. In this sense the divergences between late Byzantine and Latin theology can be even more interesting than the similarities, since they manifest a commonality and synchronism between East and West that is richer and more complex than the phenomenon of mere borrowing or assimilation. In effect, Byzantine philosophical discourse can be seen, at least on this point, as an extension of the theological debates taking place in the medieval West. Not only are Greeks and Latins learning *from each other*, then; it is clear that they were also to a great extent learning, and philosophizing, together.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abbreviations

LCL	Loeb Classical Library
PG	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i>
SG	<i>Summa contra gentiles</i>
ST	<i>Summa theologiae</i>

Primary Sources

Alexander of Hales, *Summa fratris Alexandri*, 4 vols., Quaracchi 1924–1948.

Aristotle, *De anima*, W. Biehl (editor), Leipzig 1896. In Loeb Classical Library 288, Cambridge, Mass. 1936; reprint 1957.

Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, W.D. Ross (editor), 2 vols., Oxford 1953.

Bonaventure, *Commentary on the Sentences*. In *Doctoris Seraphici Sancti Bonaventurae S.R.E. Episcopi Cardinalis Opera Omnia I*, Quaracchi 1882.

Gregory of Nazianzos, *Orations*. In J.-P. Migne (editor): *Patrologia cursus completes. Series Graeca*. T. 36, Paris, 1886. Cols. 9–62.

Gregory of Nazianzos, *Poemata arcana*, Claudio Moreschini (editor), Oxford 1997.

Gregory of Nyssa, *De anima et resurrectione*, A. Spira (editor), *Gregorii Nysseni Opera 3.3*, Leiden 2014.

Gregory of Nyssa, *De opificio hominis*. In J.-P. Migne (editor): *Patrologia cursus completes. Series Graeca*. T. 44, Paris, 1863. Cols. 123–256.

Gregory Palamas, *Homilies*. In Panagiotes Chrestou (editor), *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ ἄπαντα τὰ ἔργα*, vol. 10, ‘Ἐλληνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἑκκλησίας 76’, Thessaloniki 1985.

John of Damaskos, ‘Ἐκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὁρθοδόξου πίστεως (*Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*)’. In P.B. Kotter (editor), *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 2, *Patristische Texte und Studien* 12, Berlin 1973.

Mark Eugenikos, *De resurrectione*, Alexander Schmemann (editor), “Une oeuvre inédite de St. Marc d’Ephèse, ΠΕΡΙ ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΕΩΣ,” *Θεολογία* 22 (1951), 53–60.

Mark Eugenikos, *Πράξις Θεοδόσιου μοναχὸν ἐκπέσοντα*, Marios Pilavakis (editor), in Christian Chivu (ed.), *Ο Ἅγιος Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός. Τὰ εύρισκόμενα ἄπαντα*, vol. 1, Bucharest 2009, 304–324. Reprinted from Ὁρθόδοξος Τύπος 566 and 567 (1983), 3.

Mark Eugenikos, *Oratio prima de igne purgatorio*. In L. Petit (editor), *Documents relatifs au concile de Florence I*, Patrologia Orientalis 15.2, Paris 1927, 39–60.

Bessarion, *Responsio graecorum ad positionem Latinorum*. In L. Petit (editor), *Documents relatifs au concile de Florence I*, Patrologia Orientalis 15.2, Paris 1927, 61–79.

Maximos the Confessor, *Ambigua*, N. Constas (editor), *On Difficulties in the Church Fathers: the Ambigua of Maximos the Confessor*, vols. I-II, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 28 and 29, Cambridge, Mass. 2014.

Plotinus, *Enneads*, P. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer (editors), *Plotini Opera II: Enneades IV–V*, Brussels 1959.

Robert Grosseteste, *De luce*, Cecilia Panti (editor), in J. Flood et al. (eds.), *Robert Grosseteste and His Intellectual Milieu: New Editions and Studies*, Toronto 2013, 193–238.

Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on I Corinthians*, R. Cai (editor), *Super Epistolas S. Pauli lectura*, vol. 1, Turin 1953.

Thomas Aquinas, *De potentia*, P.M. Pession (editor), *Quaestiones disputatae*, vol. 2, Turin 1965.

Thomas Aquinas, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 5, *Pars Prima Summa Theologiae a quaestione L ad quaestionem CXIX*, Rome 1889.

Thomas Aquinas, vol. 13, *Summa contra gentiles*, Rome 1918.

Thomas Aquinas, vol. 45a, R.-A. Gauthier (editor), *Sentencia libri De anima*, Paris 1984.

Secondary Sources

Bazán, B. C. (1997). “The Human Soul: Form and Substance? Thomas Aquinas' Critique of Eclectic Aristotelianism”. In: *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 64, pp. 95–126.

Brower, J. E. (2014). *Aquinas's Ontology of the Material World: Change, Hylomorphism, and Material Objects*. Oxford.

Bynum, C. W. (1995). *The Resurrection of the Body*. New York.

Colish, M. L. (1995). “Early Scholastic Angelology”. In: *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 62. Reprinted in M.L. Colish, *Studies in Scholasticism*, Aldershot 2006, pp. 106–109.

Dales, R. C. (1995). *The Problem of the Rational Soul in the Thirteenth Century*. Leiden.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2011a). "Palamas Transformed". In: *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History*. Ed. by M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel. Leuven, pp. 263–372.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2012d). "Thomas Aquinas' Impact on Late Byzantine Theology and Philosophy: The Issues of Method or 'Modus Sciendi' and 'Dignitas Hominis'". In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz: Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 36. Berlin, pp. 333–410.

Farmer, L. L. (1997). "Matter and the Human Body According to Thomas Aquinas". PhD thesis. University of Ottawa.

Fyrigos, A. (2004a). "Tomismo e antitomismo a Bisanzio". In: *Tommaso d'Aquino e il mondo bizantino*. Ed. by A. Molle. Venafro, pp. 27–72.

Kretzmann, N. (1999). *The Metaphysics of Creation: Aquinas's Natural Theology in Summa contra gentiles II*. Oxford.

Lottin, D. O. (1932). "La composition hylémorphe des substances spirituelles: les débuts de la controverse". In: *Revue néoscholastique de philosophie* 34, pp. 21–39.

Louth, A. (2005). "St. Gregory Palamas and the Holy Mountain". In: *Mount Athos, the Sacred Bridge: The Spirituality of the Holy Mountain*. Ed. by D. Conomos and G. Speake. Bern, pp. 57–58.

Louth, A. (2007). *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681–1071*. Crestwood.

Nevitt, T. C. (2014). "Survivalism, Corruptionism, and Intermittent Existence in Aquinas". In: *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 31.1, pp. 1–19.

Papadopoulos, S. G. (1967a). Έλληνικαί μεταφράσεις Θωμιστικών ἔργων. *Φιλοθωμισταί καὶ αντιθωμισταί εν Βυζαντίῳ*. Athens.

Pilavakis, M. (1987b). "Markos Eugenikos's First Antirrhetic against Manuel Calecas's *On Essence and Energy*: Editio Princeps with Introduction and Commentary". PhD thesis. King's College, University of London.

Plestid, M. (2012e). *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*. Oxford.

Schmemann, A. (1951). "Une oeuvre inédite de St. Marc d'Ephèse, ΠΕΡΙ ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΕΩΣ". in: *Θεολογία* 22, pp. 51–64.

Stephanou, E. (1932). "La coexistence initiale du corps et de l'âme d'après s. Grégoire de Nysse et s. Maxime l'homologète". In: *Echos d'Orient* 31, pp. 304–315.

Stump, E. (2006). "Resurrection, Reassembly, and Reconstitution: Aquinas on the Soul". In: *Die menschliche Seele: Brauchen wir den Dualismus?* Ed. by B. Niederberger and E. Runggaldier. Frankfurt a. M., pp. 153–174.

Sullivan, M. B. (2010). "The Debate over Spiritual Matter in the Late Thirteenth Century: Gonsalvus Hispanus and the Franciscan Tradition from Bonaventure to Scotus". PhD thesis. Catholic University of America.

Verbeke, G. (1945). *L'évolution de la doctrine du Pneuma, du stoicism à saint Augustin*. Paris.

Georgios Steiris

Pletho, Scholarios and Arabic philosophy

Although the two worlds, Arabic and Byzantine, were in proximity for many centuries, the influence of Arabic philosophy on the Byzantine intellectual tradition has not been studied thoroughly. Recent studies have substantiated the influence of Arabic and Persian thought on Byzantine science.¹ However, in the field of philosophy, research is still at an early stage and the impact of Arabic thought on Byzantium and *vice versa* has not been examined widely or in depth. In contrast, the influence of Arabic philosophy on the Western Medieval world, as well as the means and degree of the spread of ancient Greek philosophy in the non-Greek-speaking East are well known and documented in scholarship.² Direct references in Byzantine philosophy to philosophers in the Islamic world are rare and, apart from occasional studies, there has not been a systematic, in-depth account of the influence of Arabic philosophy on Byzantine scholars.³ There is no doubt that reasons of prejudice have contributed to this limited interest, similar to the ones expressed during the 9th century by Niketas Byzantios: he argued that learning Arabic and studying Arabic literature could only be effective when dealing with the heretical arguments of the Arabs.⁴ There is also a lack of systematic studies on the impact of Byzantine thought on Arabic philosophy, despite the recent and quite noteworthy efforts.⁵ In this study I revisit and update the initial conclusions of my previous research that aims to bring out and evaluate the perceptions of Arabic philosophy among the Byzantine intelligentsia during the 14th and 15th centuries. As my primary examples I have chosen Georgios Gemistos Pletho (c. 1360–1454) and Georgios Scholarios (c. 1400–1472), whose rivalry defined Byzantine philosophy of the 15th century to a considerable degree.⁶

Although it has been argued that Pletho's *Laws* (*Nόμων Συγγραφή*) required a good knowledge of Arabic philosophy, the text itself does not verify such claims,⁷ as has been pointed out by Anastos.⁸ In several passages Pletho shows scorn for the

¹ Mavroudi 2006, 39–96; Mavroudi 2015, 28–59.

² Burrel 2012, 65–76; Donato 2006, 161–189; Taylor 2012, 509–505; Taylor 2013, 142–183, 277–296.

³ El Cheikh 2004, 100–111; von Grunebaum 1964, 89–111; Gutas 1998, 83–94, 175–186; Jokisch 2007, 25, 321–516; Mavroudi 2013, 177–204; Tatakis 2003, 77, 264.

⁴ Meyendorff 1982, 97–102; Nic. Byzant., *Confutatio*, PG 105, cols. 704, 716, 781, ed. J. P. Migne, Paris 1862; Versteegh 2013, 5–6.

⁵ Gutas 2012, 246–265; Markov 2012, 111–122; Mavroudi 2014, 151–182; Noble and Treiger 2011, 371–417; Tischler 2012, 167–195.

⁶ Barbour 1993b, 40–56; Blanchet 2008e, 177–192; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2002a, 117–171; Livanos 2006b, 127–136.

⁷ Täschner 1929, 236–243; Täschner 1929–1930, 100–113.

⁸ Anastos 1948, 183–305.

“Arabs”, concerning predominantly the Intellect, fortune and providence.⁹ In particular, Pletho held that Averroes (1126–1198) had distorted Aristotelian psychology and supported the view that the soul was mortal.¹⁰ Averroes himself was misguided and misled others who followed his views and recognized him as an *auctoritas*.¹¹ Pletho opted for an interpretation of the Averroist position on the Intellect which was not the usual one among the Scholastics, because the mortality of the soul was incompatible with Platonic tradition and Christian doctrines, and this served Pletho’s anti-Latinism.¹² Pletho also believed that Scholarios did not have a deep knowledge of Averroes’ theory of the soul. Scholarios did not stay silent nor did he hesitate to accuse Pletho of slandering Averroes. Specifically, he claimed that Pletho had misinterpreted Averroes’ views, since the majority of Jewish and Scholastic philosophers did not embrace the interpretative line of Averroes’ philosophy, which Pletho had adopted and reproduced. According to Scholarios, Averroes never claimed that the soul is mortal, and, thus, Pletho did not have a good command of either Arabic or Aristotelian philosophy.¹³ Pletho insisted that he was well informed by wise Italians¹⁴ and Jews about Averroes’ philosophy, while Scholarios’ knowledge of Averroes was superficial and his conclusions baseless.¹⁵ In addition, Pletho railed sharply against Averroes and his followers, who also misinterpreted Aristotelian philosophy in matters concerning fate and providence.¹⁶

According to Pletho, either Scholarios’ sources were inaccurate or Scholarios had misinterpreted them. Pletho claimed that his knowledge of Arabic and Scholastic philosophy came not only from written sources, but also oral ones, which indicates other ways of acquiring knowledge beyond literary sources alone.¹⁷ Pletho deliberately adopted an anti-Averroist approach, common to 15th century humanists, because it served his anti-Scholastic agenda.¹⁸ At any event, Averroism was an important concern of the Byzantine intelligentsia of the 15th century, since a significant number of scholars had at least a limited and indirect knowledge of Averroes’ philosophy.

Pletho’s criticism, however, extended to the original Aristotelian philosophy, which he considered problematic. Although it has been claimed, convincingly enough, that Pletho had been Demetrios Kydones’ (1324–1398) student and that the Aris-

⁹ Plethon, *De differentiis*, 321, 3–8, 322, 36–38.

¹⁰ Masai 1971, 435–446.

¹¹ Plethon, *De differentiis*, 321, 3–8.

¹² Averroes, *Commentarium Magnum De Anima*, 407, 496, 497; Mavroudi 2013, 198–199; de Boer 2013, 25–33.

¹³ Scholar, *La Polémique*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1935, vol. IV, p. 4.

¹⁴ Berger 2006, 79–89.

¹⁵ Pleth., *Contra Scholarii*, PG 160, ed. J. P. Migne, Paris 1866, col. 982D.

¹⁶ Pleth., *Contra Scholarii*, col. 1006B Migne.

¹⁷ Mavroudi 2013, 198–199.

¹⁸ Martin 2014, 40.

totelian aura was quite pronounced in some of his works,¹⁹ Pletho claimed that Aristotle had at first misinterpreted Plato's works but afterwards tried to build on them.²⁰ In order to prove the validity of his remarks, Pletho referred scornfully to Avicenna (980–1037). He held that even the “Arab Avicenna” (Ἀρινόενας ὁ Ἀραβός) realized the absurdity of Aristotle's view, according to which the separate Intellects are assigned to stars and spheres. Avicenna, at least, excluded God and safeguarded His transcendence.²¹ According to Pletho, Avicenna was not an original philosopher but only ineptly reproduced, in poor quality, Aristotle.²² Pletho contended that the Scholastics overrated the significance of Arabic philosophical texts. The philosophers in the Islamic world did not understand Greek philosophy properly and misinterpreted it. As a result, both they and the Scholastics distorted ancient Greek philosophy. Pletho held that the Scholastics defended their Aristotelianism on the basis of a supposed alignment of the latter's views with Christian dogma and Christian theology.²³ Given that the value of any philosophy depends on its closeness to the Christian dogma, Pletho decides to prove that the Arabic and Scholastic Aristotelianism deviated from both the original Aristotelian texts and Christian religion. In this Pletho's views influenced Renaissance scholars. Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499) held that Pletho and learned Greeks found that Averroes read the works of Aristotle in corrupted versions, because he himself did not know any Greek and the translators he trusted were not familiar enough with the Greek language.²⁴ Furthermore, Ficino held that Pletho was one the most faithful interpreters of Aristotle's philosophy, along with Pico della Mirandola (1463–1494), Theophrastus (371–287/5), Themistius (317–c. 390), Porphyrius (234–305), Simplicius (c. 490–c. 560) and Avicenna. Averroes did not make the list.²⁵ Despite Ficino's claims, it needs to be clarified that Pletho himself was not the most accurate and studious philosopher of the 15th century regarding his knowledge and use of both ancient and contemporary works. He frequently attributed to Plato views of other philosophers in order to support his argumentation²⁶ and often deleted or paraphrased paragraphs of Platonic dialogues.²⁷

¹⁹ Pleth., *Traité des vertus*, ed. and tr. B. Tambrun-Krasker, Brill 1987, pp. 30–32; Woodhouse 1986, 22, 191–214.

²⁰ Karamanolis 2002b, 259; Plethon, *De differentiis*, 330. 27, 331.31.

²¹ Hladký 2014, 197.

²² Woodhouse 1986, 193–194.

²³ Karamanolis 2002b, 262–263.

²⁴ Ficino, *Platonic Theology*, 15, 1, ed. W. R. Bowen, and J. Hankins, Cambridge M. A. 2002 (eng. tr. by M. J. B. Allen Cambridge M. A. 2002, vol. 5, p. 8–25; Hankins et al. 2002, v. 5, 15, 1; Kristeller 1956, 10; Monfasani 2002a, 197.

²⁵ Blum 2010, 96.

²⁶ Karamanolis 2002b, 260–263.

²⁷ Nikolaidou-Kyrianidou 1992, 1–62; Nikolaidou-Kyrianidou 2006, 237–269; Pagani 2009, 167–202.

Moreover, I disagree with Maria Mavroudi's argument "that part of Pletho's objective was to better understand Averroism, including its Jewish interpretation".²⁸ Pletho regarded Arabic philosophy as an enemy and was not aiming to study either it or its interpretation by Jewish and Scholastic philosophers meticulously. Pletho urged his fellow Byzantine scholars to rely on the Greek philosophical tradition, especially the Platonic and Neoplatonic one, and condemn Scholastic Aristotelianism.²⁹ According to Pletho, Aristotelian philosophy is problematic and, consequently, Arabic and Scholastic Aristotelianism lack any value. Although Scholarios argued that Elissaios – Pletho's alleged teacher – was an adherent of Averroes and other "Persian and Arabic commentators" (ἐκ Περσῶν καὶ Ἀράβων ἔξηγηταῖς),³⁰ Pletho's knowledge of Arabic philosophy was superficial and inadequate, according to Scholarios:

Τὸ δὲ κεφάλαιον αὐτῷ τῆς ἀποστασίας Ἰουδαϊος τις ὑστερον ἐνειργάσατο, ϕέροιτησεν ὡς εἰδότι τὰ Ἀριστοτέλους ἔξηγεῖσθαι καλῶς. Ὁ δὲ ἦν Ἀβερόη προσεσχηκώς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐκ Περσῶν καὶ Ἀράβων ἔξηγηταῖς τῶν Ἀριστοτελικῶν βιβλίων, ἀς Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν γλῶτταν μετήγαγον, Μωσέως δὲ καὶ ὧν Ἰουδαῖοι πιστεύουσιν ἢ θρησκεύουσι δ' αὐτὸν ἡκιστα ἥν φροντίζων. Ἐκείνος αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ περὶ Ζωροάστρου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἔξέθετο. Ἐκείνω δὴ τῷ φαινομένῳ μὲν Ἰουδαίῳ, ἐλληνιστῇ δὲ ἀκριβῶς, οὐ μόνον ὡς διδασκάλῳ πολὺν συνών χρόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπηρετῶν ἐν οἷς ἔδει καὶ ζωαρκούμενος ὑπ' ἐκείνῳ· τῶν γὰρ τὰ μάλιστα δυναμένων ἦν ἐν τῇ τῶν βαρβάρων τούτων αὐλῇ· Ἐλισσαῖος ὄνομα ἦν αὐτῷ· τοιοῦτος ἀπετελέσθη. Εἴτα πειρώμενος μὲν λανθάνειν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἡδύνατο, προαγόμενος τοῖς ὅμιλταῖς τὰς δόξας ἐνσπείρειν, ὑπὸ τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου βασιλέως τότε Μανουὴλ καὶ τῆς Ἑκκλησίας ἀπεπέμφθη τῆς πόλεως, τοῦτο μόνον οὐ καλῶς βουλευσαμένων, ὅτι φεισάμενοι οὐκ ἐνεδείξαντο τοῖς πολλοῖς αὐτὸν, οὔτε ἀτιμως ἢ εἰς βάρβαρον ἀπῆλαυνον γῆν, οὔτ' ἄλλον τινὰ τρόπον τὴν μέλλουσαν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ βλάβην ἐκώλυσαν.³¹

Pletho's references to Avicenna's and Averroes' works prove that he was only familiar with the general outline of their philosophy and had not studied their original works in depth. His comments are generalities and not adequately substantiated. As indicated by contemporary research, Pletho was acquainted with Arabic philosophy through the Byzantine translations of Aquinas' (1225–1274) works, mainly of the *Summa Theologiae*, and through his personal contacts in Italy.³² In particular, he claimed that certain Jewish and Italian philosophers had taught him Averroes' philosophy. Jozeph Matula has indicated that Pletho knew general aspects of Averroes' thought through the Greek translations of Aquinas' *De spiritualibus creaturis* and the two *Summae*.³³ John Demetracopoulos pointed out that Pletho, in his *Extracta Thomistica*, focused on passages of the *Summa Contra Gentiles*, where Aquinas described anti-Christian

²⁸ Mavroudi 2013, 197–198.

²⁹ Pleth., *Contra Scholarii*, col. 1006B Migne.

³⁰ Woodhouse 1986, 20, 24–25.

³¹ Scholar., *Lettre à la Princesse*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1935, vol. IV, pp. 152, 37–153, 15.

³² Pleth., *Contra Scholarii*, col. 982D Migne.

³³ Matula 2014, 299.

Averroist doctrines and failed to present Aquinas' criticism and revision. Pletho resorted to Prochoros Kydones' (1330–1369) translation of the *De spiritualibus creaturis* in order to build his argumentation concerning the unity of the Intellect. Pletho in fact reproduced Averroist positions, since Aquinas, for his part, relied on Averroes on the specific issue.³⁴ Recently, Matula departed from his earlier views and supported the claim that Jewish intellectuals, living in the Greek-speaking areas of the East Mediterranean sea, had a strong interest in Arabic philosophy, especially in Averroes. Pletho and other Byzantine scholars would have benefitted from their erudition and learned about Arabic and Jewish philosophy.³⁵ While Matula's argument is interesting, I suggest that it is not yet based on pertinent evidence. Specifically, he asks why Pletho did not present in detail Aquinas' views on the Intellect, if he had relied on Kydones' translation. It has been proved that Pletho was not a very systematic philosopher and that his use of sources was selective and problematic.³⁶ Likewise, we could ask a similar question: why did Pletho not present in detail Jewish interpretations of Averroes, if he was heavily influenced by Jewish intellectuals? The lack of textual evidence does not allow us to give a definitive answer. The same applies in the case of those who claim that Pletho's *Laws* are a Hellenised version of Cabala.³⁷

In my view we are obliged to reconsider the extent of influence that Elissaios and other Jews exercised over Pletho.³⁸ If Pletho had strong ties and contacts with them, he should have been more familiar with Arabic philosophy.³⁹ Jews knew Arabic philosophy well and Pletho would have understood better Averroes' and Avicenna's thought. The level of scholarship in the Jewish communities of Crete was exceptional, as is proven by Elijah Delmedigo's (c. 1458–c. 1493) and others' mastery of Arabic and Jewish philosophy.⁴⁰ Despite the attractive connection of Pletho with Middle Eastern wisdom and his portrayal as an unequalled scholar, the philosophical study of his works does not indicate a sound knowledge of Jewish and Arabic philosophy on his part, especially of the Jewish interpretation of the latter.⁴¹ Even Raymond Mercier, who supported the view that Pletho relied on the Jewish interpretation of al-Battānī's (c. 858 – 929) astronomy, could not prove in what ways Pletho knew the work of the Arab scientist.⁴² As Mavroudi has shown, the study of Arabic and Persian science in late

³⁴ J. A. Demetracopoulos 2014a, 17–20.

³⁵ Hladký 2014, 197; Matula 2014, 293–313.

³⁶ Nikolaïdou-Kyrianidou 1992, 1–62.

³⁷ Gardette 2007, 147–164; Masai 1956, 57; Siniossoglou 2011, 290; Siniossoglou 2012, 38–55.

³⁸ Nicolet and Tardieu 1980, 35–57; Woodhouse 1986, 61.

³⁹ Hladký 2014, 197; Matula 2014, 293–313.

⁴⁰ Ross 2016 (<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2016/entries/delmedigo/>).

⁴¹ Woodhouse 1986, 61.

⁴² Mercier 2003, 206–207.

Byzantium was something easily accessible and common, but the same has not yet been shown to apply for Arabic philosophy.⁴³

I argue that Pletho's critical stance towards Arabic philosophy is in fact a result of his hostility towards Scholasticism.⁴⁴ Pletho belonged to those Byzantine scholars who refused to accept the thought that Western Europeans had advanced in philosophy during the Middle Ages. They were particularly disturbed by the study of Aristotelian texts in Medieval Europe being done from translations and not from the original. This to them was an unsurmountable disadvantage. In addition, Pletho was annoyed that the Scholastics had elected to read and interpret Aristotle using works of Arabic philosophers rather than Greek. He questioned their philosophical acumen, without having himself obtained a sound knowledge of Scholastic philosophy or of the level it had reached. Also, as Demetracopoulos has proven, Pletho freely reproduced paragraphs from *Summa Contra Gentiles*, where Aquinas discusses Averroes' views as incompatible with Christian doctrine but without mentioning Aquinas' comments.⁴⁵

For his part, Georgios Gennadios Scholarios dealt systematically with Scholastic philosophy. In his texts he discusses Aquinas' views extensively, through which he came into indirect contact with the works of philosophers in the Islamic world, as I have argued in a recent article.⁴⁶ In an epistle to the emperor Constantine XI Paleologus (1405–1453) (Τῷ ὑψηλοτάτῳ καὶ πανευτυχεστάτῳ δεσπότῃ κῦρ Κωνσταντίνῳ τῷ Παλαιολόγῳ)⁴⁷ which preceded his' commentary on Aristotle's works,⁴⁸ Scholarios offers a vivid description of his intellectual journey and boasts about his own erudition. He asserts that he has read Western Medieval philosophy extensively: specifically, most of ancient and middle Latin scholarship and the vast majority of more recent production, e. g. the Scholastics. Moreover, he had read all the works of Avicenna, Averroes and other "Arab and Persian" philosophers⁴⁹. According to Scholarios, Averroes was the best among the commentators of Aristotle and an excellent original philosopher who helped him improve his understanding of Aristotelian philosophy.⁵⁰ Despite Scholarios' claims about his erudition in Arabic and Persian philosophy, a detailed examination of his works proves that in most cases he simply reproduced and incorporated sections from Aquinas' works, without resorting to the original sources. Schol-

43 Mavroudi 2015, 28–59.

44 Fink 2011, 483–497.

45 Dedes 1985, 352–375; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2006c, 276–341; J. A. Demetracopoulos 2002a, 117–171; Mavroudi 2013, 197–198.

46 Steiris and Lyckoura 2013, 51–74.

47 Scholar., *Épître dédicatoire*, pp. 1–6 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

48 Scholar., *Commentaires des ouvrages d'Aristote*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1936, vol. VII, 7–509.

49 Scholar., *Épître dédicatoire*, p. 3, 19 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

50 Scholar., *Épître dédicatoire*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1936, vol. VII, p. 3, 18.

arios refrained frequently from mentioning philosophers writing in Arabic, although he commented on passages in Aquinas dedicated to Avicenna or Averroes.

In his *Synopsis of Summa's Theologiae Prima Pars* (Ia)⁵¹ (Ἐκ τοῦ Θεολογικοῦ. Ἐκ τῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀποσημειώσεις τινές) and *Prima Secundae* (Ia-IIae) (Ἐκλογὴ τοῦ πρώτου τῶν Ἡθικῶν τοῦ σοφωτάτου Θωμᾶ Δέ Ακίνο, τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ καὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν ζητημάτων πάντων πεφυλαγμένων),⁵² Scholarios referred occasionally to philosophers in the Islamic world, mentioning Avicenna twice, Averroes three times, both of whom Aquinas referred to multiple times, and mentioning somes though not by name. Scholarios rejected the “Ἄβινσένου δόξα”⁵³ that God produces the First Intellect by thinking Himself and that the First Intellect, by thinking the First Cause, produces the Second Intellect. According to Avicenna, as summarized by Scholarios, the First Intellect thinks of Itself and produces heaven's body and soul. Scholarios objected to this, affirming that the creative power belongs exclusively to God. The differentiation of beings is due to Divine Wisdom, as *Genesis* makes clear.⁵⁴ In fact, according to Avicenna, through the act by which the first caused intelligence thinks of the First Principle and aims at it, a further intelligence is originated; through the act by which the first caused intelligence thinks of itself and aims at itself, two entities are originated: a soul, that is to say, an intelligence bound to a body, and the celestial body to which this intelligence is bound.⁵⁵ It is clear that Scholarios draws his information on Avicenna's views from Aquinas, whose arguments he uses to reply to Avicenna.⁵⁶ Later, Scholarios referred to Avicenna when examining whether virtue is by nature or not.⁵⁷ According to the Byzantine philosopher, Avicenna supported the view that virtue stems from the Intellect and is not immanent, as Aristotle and the Platonists held. In this section of his text Scholarios also cites Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, the Platonists and Aristotle. He then follows the progression of Aquinas' argument, successfully and convincingly summarising his argumentation.⁵⁸ He quotes Avicenna's view most probably because it does not contradict the Christian understanding of the theological virtues. Aquinas' practice confirms this opinion, since not only is he himself well-disposed towards it, but he also uses it to shape his final conclusion.⁵⁹

⁵¹ Scholar., *Résumé de la Somme théologique*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1931, vol. V, pp. 338–510.

⁵² Scholar., *Résumé de la “Prima Secundae,”* ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1933, vol. VI, pp. 1–153.

⁵³ Scholar., *Extraits*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1931, vol. V, p. 386, 8.

⁵⁴ Scholar., *Extraits*, p. 386, 7–19 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

⁵⁵ Avicenna, *Al-Ilahiyāt Min Al-Shifā’*, IX, 2, 386–387.

⁵⁶ Aquinas, *ST* Ia q. 47, a. 1, co.

⁵⁷ Scholar., *Des habitudes et des vertus*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1933, vol. VI, p. 67, 32–33.

⁵⁸ Aquinas, *ST* Ia-IIae q. 63, a. 1, s. c.; *ST* Ia-IIae q. 63, a. 1, co.

⁵⁹ Steiris and Lyckoura 2013, 56–57.

Scholarios makes three references to Averroes. First, he cites him when describing Aquinas' views on the creation and separation of material bodies. According to Scholarios, Averroes asserted that heavenly matter, properly speaking, is potency as far as species or soul.⁶⁰ In this case the reference to Averroes does not play a crucial role in Scholarios' argumentation but is a reminder of a view that is within the scope of the solutions that could qualify. For this reason Scholarios does not insist on analysing it further. At this point, Scholarios' reliance on Aquinas' argumentation, which he follows, is obvious.⁶¹ Scholarios was more careful and detailed when he commented on the highly debated issue concerning the union of body and soul. Using Thomistic assumptions, he rejected the view of Alexander of Aphrodisias (2nd-3rd century AD) and Averroes that “Ἄδύνατον ἄρα καὶ μίαν τῷ ἀριθμῷ Ψυχὴν νοερὰν εἶναι διαφόρων τῷ ἀριθμῷ,”⁶² which he attributes to both Alexander of Aphrodisias and Averroes. Scholarios tries to prove with arguments the absurdity of Averroes' view;⁶³ he obviously considered the aforementioned position to be of great importance and this is the reason he chose to discuss it in detail. While Scholarios' arguments are based for the most part on those of Aquinas, it is worth noticing that he seems to harmonize Alexander's and Averroes' views on the Passive and Active Intellect, in an evidently inaccurate way and not in accord with Aquinas' view.⁶⁴ Scholarios was improvising, since in the aforementioned passage of the *Summa Theologiae* there are no references to Averroes and Alexander of Aphrodisias.⁶⁵ Furthermore, Scholarios uses exactly Aquinas' arguments to reject the view that he himself has attributed to Averroes and Alexander of Aphrodisias, when he mentions that “καὶ ἀπλῶς ὅπως ἂν ἔνοιτο ὁ νοῦς τῷ σώματι, ἀδύνατος ἡ Ἀβερόου θέσις.”⁶⁶ This is the section of the text where Scholarios takes the initiative and attempts to articulate his own philosophical expression of Averroes' philosophy, using a widely known and popular thesis of the philosopher. His effort, however, is not particularly successful. Finally, Scholarios cites Averroes when discussing the relation of humankind with the rest of creation. According to our Byzantine philosopher, Averroes held that science exists in the proper handling of the student's mind so the latter can reach the level of the intellectual perception of concepts.⁶⁷ Scholarios adopted the core of Averroes' position as presented by Aquinas, although he had a few objections. Right after Averroes' thesis, Scholarios cites the Platonic argument

60 Scholar., *Traité de la création corporelle*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1931, vol. V, p. 419, 40.

61 Aquinas, *ST* Ia q. 66, a. 2, co.

62 Scholar., *Traité de l'homme*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1931, vol. V, p. 434, 1–2.

63 Scholar., *Traité de l'homme*, p. 434, 3–18 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

64 Crawford 1963, 383–413; Davidson 1992, 220–356; Leaman 1988, 82–116.

65 Aquinas, *ST* Ia q. 76, a. 2, co.; *ST* Ia q. 76, a 2, s. c.

66 Scholar., *Traité de l'homme*, p. 434, 10–11 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

67 Scholar., *Traité du gouvernement divin*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1931, vol. V, p. 504, 28–30.

of *anamnesis* – the idea that knowledge consists in recollections already possessed by the soul from its previous lives – from which he seems to distance himself. Aquinas in his *Summa Theologiae*, the text on which Scholarios based himself, holds exactly the same stance towards Averroes' thesis.⁶⁸

In the rest of his *Synopsis* Scholarios occasionally reproduces views of Arabic philosophers without mentioning them by name. By carefully comparing Aquinas' and Scholarios' texts, the reader can trace the passages where Avicenna's and Averroes' views are presented, for Aquinas explicitly referred to his sources. On the other hand, Scholarios does not inform his reader that Aquinas commented, even indirectly, on the Arabic philosophers. One might see this as an example of the common practice among Byzantine writers not to mention their sources explicitly. However, this is not usually the case with Scholarios, since he frequently names his sources, especially when using ancient Greek or Christian authors. Indicative of Scholarios habit not to name Islamic thinkers, even if Aquinas had mentioned them, is the next passage, in which Scholarios discusses God's infinity. In the original passage from *Summa Theologiae* Aquinas mentions Avicenna and al-Ghazali, although he rejects their views.

Οτι ουδε το κατ' αριθμὸν ἄπειρον ἐν τοῖς οὖσίν ἔστιν, εἴπερ πᾶς ἀριθμὸς μονάδι μετρεῖται, καὶ μονάδι ὥρισται, καὶ εἴπερ πᾶν κτιστόν ἐν ὥρισμένῳ λογισμῷ του δημιουργοῦ περιέχεται. Δύναται μέντοι δυνάμει εἶναι πλῆθος ἄπειρον· ἔπειται γὰρ τῇ τοῦ μεγέθους διαιρέσει.⁶⁹

*Quidam enim, sicut Avicenna et Algazel, dixerunt quod impossibile est esse multitudinem actu infinitam per se, sed infinitam per accidens multitudinem esse, non est impossibile.*⁷⁰

According to Aquinas, Avicenna and al-Ghazali hold that a *per accidens* infinity is actual. Scholarios shares Aquinas' reluctance to accept an actual *per accidens* infinity. A possible explanation of their reluctance could be that Avicenna's and al-Ghazali's views on infinite break the causal chain between the one and the multitude. In addition, consecutive overflows, emanating from the Active Intellect and spreading to the accidents, go against the doctrines of Orthodoxy. According to Avicenna, the nine primary spheres are accompanied by an incorporeal intelligence. All the spheres and the intelligences are the products of successive emanations in order to be explained the derivation of the plural and diversified universe from a unitary First Cause.⁷¹ As a result, every emanation participates decreased in the previous substance, which, as Scholarios argues, can not happen with divine essence. Therefore, Scholarios was able to avoid the reference to Avicenna's view and use only Aquinas' answer, which agrees with Christian doctrine.

⁶⁸ Aquinas, ST Ia q. 117, a. 1, co.; Steiris and Lyckoura 2013, 57–60.

⁶⁹ Scholar., *Traité de Dien*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1931, vol. V, p. 344, 29–32.

⁷⁰ Aquinas, ST Ia q. 7, a. 4, co.

⁷¹ Davidson 1992, 74–123.

Again, Scholarios refrained from mentioning Avicenna when he summarized Aquinas' views on the unity of God. He did not cite Avicenna even when he commented directly on the latter's argument. He paraphrased Avicenna's definition and adapted it to Christian beliefs.

E contrario autem Avicenna, considerans quod unum quod est principium numeri, addit aliquam rem supra substantiam entis (alias numerus ex unitatibus compositus non esset species quantitatis), credit quod unum quod convertitur cum ente, addat rem aliquam supra substantiam entis, sicut album supra hominem. Sed hoc manifeste falsum est, quia quaelibet res est una per suam substantiam. Si enim per aliquid aliud esset una quaelibet res, cum illud iterum sit unum, si esset iterum unum per aliquid aliud, esset abire in infinitum. Unde standum est in primo. Sic igitur dicendum est quod unum quod convertitur cum ente, non addit aliquam rem supra ens, sed unum quod est principium numeri, addit aliquid supra ens, ad genus quantitatis pertinens.⁷²

is summarised by Scholarios as:

Ότι τὸ μὲν ἀντιστρέφον τῷ ὄντι ἐν οὐ προστίθησι τῷ δόντι. Πᾶν γὰρ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ οὐσίαν ἐν ἔστιν· δὲ ἔστιν ἀρχὴ ἀριθμού προστίθησιν· ἔστι γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ποσοῦ γένει οἰκεῖον.⁷³

Once again there are no direct comments on Avicenna's arguments, although Scholarios adopts Aquinas' main thesis, which agrees with Christian theology. However, he avoids mentioning Avicenna, even when commenting directly on the views of the philosopher. In particular, when dealing with the matter of truth, Scholarios paraphrases Avicenna's definition and claims that “ἀρχοειδῶς μὲν ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ νῷ,”⁷⁴ without explaining convincingly the way in which this happens.⁷⁵ However, while he preserves the basic concept of Avicenna's thesis, he adapts it to suit Christian perceptions:⁷⁶

Et quedam definitio Avicennae, veritas uniuscuiusque rei est proprietas sui esse quod stabilitum est ei. Quod autem dicitur quod veritas est adaequatio rei et intellectus potest ad utrumque pertinere.⁷⁶

Ότι τὸ μὲν ἀγαθόν, οὗ ἡ ἔφεσίς ἔστιν ἐν τῷ ἐπιθυμητῷ, εἰς δὲ ἔφεσίς ὁρέπει· ἡ δὲ ἀλήθεια, ἐν τῷ νῷ. Ός δὲ τὸ ἀγαθόν μέτεισιν ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος πρὸς τὴν ἔφεσιν, ὡς εἶναι ἀγαθὴν ἔφεσιν τὴν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ πράγματος, οὕτω καὶ ὡς ἐν τῷ νῷ τοῦ ἀληθοῦ λόγος μέτεισιν ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦ εἰς τὸ νοητὸν πρᾶγμα, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸν ἀληθὲς λέγεσθαι, ὡς ἀληθῆς οἰκία ἡ ἐμφερῆς τῇ ἐν τῇ διανοΐᾳ τοῦ οἰκοδόμου, καὶ ἀληθῆς λόγος, ὡς τοῦ ἀληθοῦ νοῦ σημεῖον· καὶ οὕτως ἀρχοειδῶς μὲν ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ νῷ, δεύτερον δὲ κάν τοῖς πράγμασιν, καθόσον πρὸς τὸν νοῦν παραβάλλονται ὡς ἀρχῆν.⁷⁷

72 Aquinas, *ST* Ia q. 11, a. 1, ad 1.

73 Schol., *Traité de Dien*, p. 346, 6–8 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

74 Schol., *Traité de Dien*, p. 352, 19 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

75 Steiris and Lyckoura 2013, 60–65.

76 Aquinas, *ST* Ia q. 16, a. 1, co.

77 Schol., *Traité de Dien*, p. 352, 13–21 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

Furthermore, Scholarios did not resort to philosophers from the Arabic world although their interpretations and solutions were more accurate and interesting in comparison to the views of Aquinas and other Scholastics. For example, although Aquinas rested on Avicenna's description of the sensitive powers of the soul, Scholarios chose to present only Aquinas' personal and superficial analysis and not the latter's thorough presentation of Avicenna's and Averroes' argumentation.

Sed contra est quod Avicenna, in suo libro de anima, ponit quinque potentias sensitivas interiores, scilicet sensum communem, phantasiam, imaginativam, aestimativam, et memorativam.⁷⁸

Τέσσαρες οὖν εἰσὶν οὕτω δυνάμεις ἔνδον τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ μέρους: ἡ κοινὴ αἴσθησις, ἡ φαντασία, ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ μνήμη.⁷⁹

Elsewhere, Scholarios summarises Aquinas' views concerning the nature of God. While Aquinas mentioned Avicenna, Scholarios summarizes Aquinas' argument skipping the reference to Avicenna:

Praeterea, relationes reales accipiuntur in Deo secundum processionem intelligibilem verbi. Sed relationes intelligibiles multiplicantur in infinitum, ut Avicenna dicit. Ergo in Deo sunt infinitae relationes reales.⁸⁰

Εἰ δὲ μὴ εἶναι αἱ αὐτὰ τῇ οὐσίᾳ τῷ πράγματι, ἔσονται κτίσματα, καὶ ἔσται τι κτίσμα ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ὡς πρᾶγμα, καὶ τὰ κατ' αὐτὰς προϊόντα κτιστὰ ἔσονται, διὰ τῆς ὁρθῆς πίστεως ἔξω. Εἰσὶ δὲ ἀναφοραὶ ἑκεῖ, ἔνθα μὲν πατρότης καὶ νιότης, ἔνθα δὲ πνεῦσις καὶ ἐκπόρευσις, οὐλὶκές ἔχονται τῆς προόδου τῆς ἀγάπης ἴδιον ὄνομα.⁸¹

Aquinas tries to define the divine energies based on the divine relations: fatherhood, filiation and spiration. Aquinas' approach does not contravene the Orthodox doctrine. Scholarios' brief answers reveal his effort not to depart from the correct dogmatic wording. Thus, this is his reason for not referring to Aristotle, Augustine (354–430) or Avicenna.

On the matter of creation by God, Scholarios summarises Aquinas as:

"Οτι τὸ δημιουργεῖν ἔστι τοῦ Θεοῦ. Αὐτὸς γάρ μόνος προάγει ἀπολελυμένως τὸ εἶναι οὐ καθόσον τοῦτο ἡ ἐκεῖνο· τοῦτο δὲ τῷ τῆς δημιουργίας ἀνήκει λόγω· τινὶ δὲ τῶν κτισμάτων ἀδύνατον ἀρμόζειν τὸ δημιουργεῖν ἡ ίδια δυνάμει, ἡ ὄργανικῶς, ἡ ὑπουργικῶς, ἀλλὰ πάντα ποιοῦσιν ἐκ προϋποκειμένου, ἡ προϋποκειμένου τινός, ὅπερ ἐναντίον τῷ τῆς δημιουργίας λόγῳ· καὶ ὅτι τὸ ἐκ μηδενός δημιουργεῖν ἀπειρω προσήκει δυνάμει· δημιουργεῖ γάρ ἡ τοιαύτη δύναμις ἐκ μηδεμιᾶς προϋποκειμένης δυνάμεως, ὡς ἡ τοῦ πρώτου ποιοῦντος δύναμις. Οὐδεμίᾳ δέ ἔστιν ἀναλογία τῆς οὐδεμιᾶς δυνάμεως πρὸς τὴν τινα, ἵνα προϋποτίθησιν ἡ παντός τοῦ φύσει ποιοῦντος δύναμις,

78 Aquinas, *ST* Ia q. 78, a. 4, s. c.

79 Scholar., *Traité de l'homme*, p. 445, 3–4 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

80 Aquinas, *ST* Ia q. 28, a. 4, arg. 2.

81 Scholar., *Traité de la Trinité*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1931, vol. V, p. 370, 1–5.

ώσπερ ούδε τοῦ μὴ ὄντος πρὸς τὸ ὄν. Εἰ οὖν οὐδὲν κτίσμα δύναμιν ἀπειρον ἔχει, οὐδὲ δημιουργεῖν δύναται.⁸²

Et sic posuit Avicenna quod prima substantia separata, creata a Deo, creat aliam post se, et substantiam orbis, et animam eius; et quod substantia orbis creat materiam inferiorum corporum. Et secundum hunc etiam modum Magister dicit, in V dist. IV Sent., quod Deus potest creaturae communicare potentiam creandi, ut creet per ministerium, non propria auctoritate. Sed hoc esse non potest. Quia causa secunda instrumentalis non participat actionem causae superioris, nisi in quantum per aliquid sibi proprium dispositio operatur ad effectum principalis agentis. Si igitur nihil ibi ageret secundum illud quod est sibi proprium, frustra adhiceretur ad agendum, nec oportaret esse determinata instrumenta determinatarum actionum. Sic enim videmus quod securis, scindendo lignum, quod habet ex proprietate suae formae, producit scamni formam, quae est effectus proprius principalis agentis. Illud autem quod est proprius effectus Dei creantis, est illud quod praesupponitur omnibus aliis, scilicet esse absolute. Unde non potest aliquid operari dispositio et instrumentaliter ad hunc effectum, cum creatio non sit ex aliquo praesupposito, quod possit disponi per actionem instrumentalis agentis. Sic igitur impossibile est quod alicui creaturae conveniat creare, neque virtute propria, neque instrumentaliter sive per ministerium. Et hoc praecipue inconveniens est dici de aliquo corpore, quod creet, cum nullum corpus agat nisi tangendo vel movendo; et sic requirit in sua actione aliquid praeexistens, quod possit tangi et moveri; quod est contra rationem creationis.⁸³

Scholarios quotes Aquinas' answer to Avicenna, not word for word, without first mentioning what exactly Avicenna had previously argued. The quotation is not word for word. Scholarios' omission of any such mention betrays his opposition to Avicenna's view on the existence of a first substance created by God that can afterwards create the world and its soul anew and, subsequently, new creative causes. It was widely known that Avicenna claimed that production from the First Cause concerns intelligences, then souls and lastly the celestial bodies. Scholarios holds that created beings cannot create either “ὄργανικῶς” or “ὑπουργικῶς.”

On the cognitive soul, Scholarios replied to Avicenna, again without mentioning him.

Sed tamen Averroes, in Comment. tertii de anima, ponit quod in fine in hac vita homo pervenire potest ad hoc quod intelligat substantias separatas, per continuationem vel unionem cuiusdam substantiae separatae nobis, quam vocat intellectum agentem, qui quidem, cum sit substantia separata, naturaliter substantias separatas intelligit. Unde cum fuerit nobis perfecte unitus, sic ut per eum perfecte intelligere possimus, intelligemus et nos substantias separatas; sicut nunc per intellectum possibilem nobis unitum intelligimus res materiales.⁸⁴

Ἐν οὐδενὶ γάρ λόγῳ εἰσὶ πρὸς τὸν ἡμέτερον νοῦν κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν χωήν, ὥστε ὑπ’ ἐκείνου νοεῖσθαι δύνασθαι. Γιγνώσκουσα μέντοι ἔαυτὴν ἡ ψυχή, ἀφικνεῖται καὶ πρὸς τὸ κτήσασθαι τινα

⁸² Scholar, *Traité de la creation en general*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1931, vol. V, pp. 379, 38–380, 10.

⁸³ Aquinas, *ST* Ia q. 45, a. 5, co.

⁸⁴ Aquinas, *ST* Ia q. 88, a. 1, co.

περὶ τῶν ἀσωμάτων οὐσιῶν ἐπιστήμην τὴν δυνατήν· οὐ τῷ ἔαυτῇ γιγνώσκειν κάκείνας ἀπλῶς καὶ τελείως γιγνώσκει.⁸⁵

In particular, on the matter of cognitive powers of the soul, Scholarios notes that “ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων δῆλον ἐστιν, ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐπιφρεῖ τῇ ψυχῇ ἀπό τινων χωριστῶν εἰδῶν τὰ εἴδη δι’ ὃν νοεῖ καὶ ἐπίσταται.”⁸⁶ According to Aquinas, for Avicenna the intelligibles in the human soul are emanations from the Active Intellect, while the sensibles are emanations from matter.⁸⁷ Scholarios held that Avicenna’s position is false, since the soul did not receive the intelligibles through emanation from something external. He also rejected Avicenna’s view concerning the existence of multiple minds. Later in the text, Aquinas cited Plato, Aristotle and Averroes as his sources when discussing the ability of the soul to apprehend immaterial substances.⁸⁸ Although Scholarios commented on the views of each of them, he avoided mentioning Averroes, but he did name Plato and Aristotle.⁸⁹ Probably Scholarios, like Demetrios Kydones in his translation of the *Summa theologiae*, avoided unnecessarily mentioning Averroes or Avicenna, because he did not want to name persons whose original work was unfamiliar to him.⁹⁰

Dealing with the cooperation of the angels in creation, Scholarios states that:

“Οτι διὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἡ σωματικὴ διοικεῖται κτίσις· τοῦτο γάρ οὐκ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγίων διδασκάλων λέγεται μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν φιλοσόφων τῶν τὰς ἀσωμάτους οὐσίας τιθέντων.”⁹¹

In the corresponding passage of *Summa Theologiae* Aquinas bases his argumentation on Avicenna:

*Avicenna vero medianam viam secutus est. Posuit enim cum Platone, aliquam substantiam spiritualem praesidentem immediate sphaerae activorum et passivorum; eo quod, sicut Plato ponebat quod formae horum sensibilium derivantur a substantiis immaterialibus, ita etiam Avicenna hoc posuit. Sed in hoc a Platone differt, quod posuit unam tantum substantiam immaterialem praesidentem omnibus corporibus inferioribus, quam vocavit intelligentiam agentem. Doctores autem sancti posuerunt, sicut et Platonici, diversis rebus corporeis diversas substantias spirituales esse praepositas.*⁹²

While Aquinas argues that philosophers have different views concerning incorporeal substances, Scholarios claims that both the philosophers who address the matter of incorporeal substances and the Fathers believe that creation is governed by angels.

⁸⁵ Scholar., *Traité de l'homme*, p. 464, 9–13 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

⁸⁶ Scholar., *Traité de l'homme*, p. 455, 32–33 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

⁸⁷ Aquinas, *ST* I^a q. 84, a. 4, co.

⁸⁸ Aquinas, *ST* I^a q. 88, a. 1, co.

⁸⁹ Scholar., *Traité de l'homme*, p. 463, 38–40, 464, 1–13 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

⁹⁰ Wright 2013a, 15–30.

⁹¹ Scholar., *Traité du gouvernement divin*, p. 494, 11–13 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

⁹² Aquinas, *ST* I^a q. 110, a. 1, ad 3.

In fact, Plato, Aristotle and Avicenna refer to the existence of incorporeal substances, which either form the kinds of corporeal substances (Plato) or they do not (Aristotle). Nevertheless, they agree that the incorporeal substances are more universal and superior to the corporeal. Avicenna supports the same thesis, with the difference that he believes there is only one incorporeal substance, which governs the corporeal and is called Active Intellect. Scholarios' phrasing does not make clear whether he includes Avicenna in his answer or whether his use of plural in the passage “τῶν τὰς ἀσωμάτους οὐσίας τιθέντων” aims at the removal of any reference to Avicenna.

Again prompted by a discussion of angelic influence on creation, Aquinas observes that the “Platonists” and Avicenna equate forms with the Platonic ideas.⁹³ Further on, he bases his view on Avicenna:

Respondeo dicendum quod Platonici posuerunt formas quae sunt in materia, causari ex immateri-alibus formis, quia formas materiales ponebant esse participationes quasdam immaterialium for-marum. Et hos, quantum ad aliquid, secutus est Avicenna, qui posuit omnes formas quae sunt in materia, procedere a conceptione intelligentiae, et quod agentia corporalia sunt solum disponen-tia ad formas. Qui in hoc videntur fuisse decepti, quia existimaverunt formam quasi aliquid per se factum, ut sic ab aliquo formali principio procederet. Sed sicut philosophus probat in VII Meta-phys., hoc quod proprie fit, est compositum, hoc enim proprie est quasi subsistens. Forma autem non dicitur ens quasi ipsa sit, sed sicut quo aliquid est, et sic per consequens nec forma proprie fit; eius enim est fieri, cuius est esse, cum fieri nihil aliud sit quam via in esse. Manifestum est autem quod factum est simile facienti, quia omne agens agit sibi simile. Et ideo id quod facit res naturales, habet similitudinem cum composito, vel quia est compositum, sicut ignis generat ignem; vel quia totum compositum, et quantum ad materiam et quantum ad formam, est in virtute ipsius; quod est proprium Dei. Sic igitur omnis informatio materiae vel est a Deo immediate, vel ab aliquo agente corporali; non autem immediate ab Angelo.⁹⁴

Scholarios, however, does not refer to Aquinas' main answer but uses parts of his answer to the second⁹⁵ and especially the third objection,⁹⁶ where Aquinas revisits the subject of the question, i. e. whether corporeal matter obeys the will of angels:

“Οτι ἡ εἰδοποίησις τῆς ὑλης οὐχ ὑπακούει τῷ νεύματι τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἀλλ’ ἡ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀμέσως, ἡ παρά τινος ποιοῦντος σωματικοῦ. Μεταβάλλει μέντοι τὴν ὑλην ὑψηλότερον τρόπον ὁ ἄγγελος ἡ τὰ σωματικῶς ποιοῦντα, κινῶν αὐτὰ ὡς αἵτια ὑψηλοτέρα τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν τῷ νεύματι

⁹³ *Qui (Platonici et Avicenna) in hoc videntur fuisse decepti, quia existimaverunt formam quasi aliquid per se factum, ut sic ab aliquo formali principio procedere (ST Ia q. 110, a. 2, co.)*

⁹⁴ Aquinas, ST Ia q. 110, a. 2, co.

⁹⁵ *Et sic Angelus excellentiori modo transmutat materiam corporalem quam agentia corporalia, scilicet movendo ipsa agentia corporalia, tanquam causa superior (ST Ia q. 110, a. 2, ad 2.).*

⁹⁶ *Ad tertium dicendum quod nihil prohibet ex virtute Angelorum aliquos effectus sequi in rebus naturalibus, ad quae agentia corporalia non sufficerent. Sed hoc non est obedire materiam Angelis ad nutum; sicut nec coquis obedit materia ad nutum, quia aliquem modum decoctionis operantur per ignem secundum aliquam artis moderationem, quam ignis per se non faceret, cum reducere materiam in actum formae substantialis, non excedat virtutem corporalis agentis, quia simile natum est sibi simile facere (ST Ia q. 110, a. 2, ad 3.).*

τῶν ἀγγέλων τὴν ὑλην· οὐδὲ γάρ τῷ νεύματι τῶν ὄφοποιῶν ὑπείκει ἡ ὑλη, ἐνεργούντων τρόπους τινὰς ἐψήσεως διὰ τοῦ πυρός, τῆς τέχνης αὐτοὺς ὁυθμιζόντης, ὅπερ καθ' ἑαυτὸ οὐκ ἀνέποιει τὸ πῦρ.⁹⁷

Again, concerning the so-called evil eye Scholarios avoids any of mention Avicenna, although Aquinas bases himself on the Persian philosopher:

*Ad secundum dicendum quod fascinationis causam assignavit Avicenna ex hoc, quod materia corporalis nata est obedire spirituali substantiae magis quam contrariis agentibus in natura. Et ideo quando anima fuerit fortis in sua imaginatione, corporalis materia immutatur secundum eam. Et hanc dicit esse causam oculi fascinantis. Sed supra ostensum est quod materia corporalis non obedit substantiae spirituali ad nutum, nisi soli creatori. Et ideo melius dicendum est, quod ex forti imaginatione animae immutantur spiritus corporis coniuncti. Quae quidem immutatio spirituum maxime fit in oculis, ad quos subtiliores spiritus perveniunt. Oculi autem inficiunt aerem continuum usque ad determinatum spatium, per quem modum specula, si fuerint nova et pura, contrahunt quandam impuritatem ex aspectu mulieris menstruatae, ut Aristoteles dicit in libro de Somn. et Vig. Sic igitur cum aliqua anima fuerit vehementer commota ad malitiam, sicut maxime in vetubus contingit, efficit secundum modum praedictum aspectus eius venenosus et noxius, et maxime pueris, qui habent corpus tenerum, et de facili receptivum impressionis. Possibile est etiam quod ex Dei permissione, vel etiam ex aliquo facto occulto, cooperetur ad hoc malignitas Daemonum, cum quibus vetulae sortilegæ aliquod foedus habent.*⁹⁸

"Οτι ου δύναται ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμει τὴν σωματικὴν ὑλην μεταβάλλειν, μόνῳ τῷ θειῷ ὑπείκουσαν νεύματι· | εἰ γάρ μηδὲ ἄγγελοι τοῦτο δύνανται, σχολῆ γε οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῇ φυσικῇ ἔαντων δυνάμει. Εἰ δὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι θαύματα ποιεῖν λέγονται, τῇ τῆς χάριτος δυνάμει, οὐ τῇ φύσεως· ἡ δὲ ἀδομένη βασκανία γίνεται οὕτως· ἡ ἰσχυρὰ τῆς ψυχῆς φαντασία μεταβάλλει τὸ ψυχικὸν πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ μεταβολὴ αὐτῆς μάλιστα γίνεται ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς, ἐφ' οὓς ὡς λεπτοτέρους ἀφικεῖται τὸ πνεῦμα· οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ μολύνουσι τὸν συνεχῆ ἀέρα μέχρις ὥρισμένου διαστήματος, ὃν τρόπον καὶ τὰ κάτοπτρα, νέα ὄντα καὶ καθαρά, ἐφέλκοντα τίνα κηλίδα ἐκ τῆς ὄψεως τῶν ἐν τοῖς καταμηνοίσι οὐσῶν γυναικῶν, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης δοκεῖ ἐν τῷ περὶ ὑπνοῦ καὶ ἐγρηγόρσεως. "Οταν οὖν τις ψυχὴ ἐπὶ πονηρίαν οὕτω σφιδρῶς κινηθῇ, δὲ μάλιστα ταῖς γραυοὶ συμβαίνει, γίνεται ἡ ὄψις δηλητηρώδης διὰ ταῦτα καὶ βλαβερά, καὶ μάλιστα παισίν, ἀπαλὸν ἔχουσι τὸ σῶμα καὶ ράδιως τῶν δράσεων δεκτικόν. Δυνατὸν δὲ καὶ συγχωρήσει Θεοῦ, ἢ καὶ τίνος λανθανούστης ἐνεργείας δαιμόνων συνεργούστης, μεθ' ὧν αἱ γραῖαι τίνας ἔχουσι πίστεις, τοιαῦτα γίνεσθαι."⁹⁹

Once again Scholarios mentions neither Avicenna nor his exact views, but he does refer to them obliquely in the light of Aquinas' argumentation. Specifically, according to Aquinas, Avicenna considers the cause of magic to be a natural tendency of corporeal matter to obey spiritual substance rather than natural contrary agents. Therefore, according to Avicenna, when imagination is strong it can change corporeal matter, which would also be the cause of the evil eye.¹⁰⁰ However, this cannot happen consider-

⁹⁷ Scholar., *Traité du gouvernement divin*, p. 494, 14–20 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

⁹⁸ Aquinas, *ST* Ia q. 117, a. 3, ad 2.

⁹⁹ Scholar., *Traité du gouvernement divin*, pp. 505, 24–506, 2 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

¹⁰⁰ Aquinas, *ST* Ia q. 117, a. 3, ad 2.

ing that, as Aquinas has previously argued, matter does not obey spiritual substances but God alone.¹⁰¹ Aquinas is not entirely opposing Avicenna's view, but tries to process it in order to adjust it, given that the evil eye is for the most part accepted by Christian theology. To confirm this, he advises that this problem be stated¹⁰² from a different approach. Scholarios reproduces this adjustment of Aquinas in his text, without mentioning that it comes from Avicenna.

Particularly enlightening is the way in which Scholarios deals with the question of anger. Aquinas defines the essence of anger and what it is that renders it a passion.¹⁰³ To explain why anger is not in the genus of passions by causality he follows Augustine's view on love, namely that love may be a general category of passions. To defend his view that anger may be a general category of passions (i. e. the irascible) – in the sense that an effect that is produced by many causes has in some way the sense of genus – he uses an Aristotelian interpretation. Finally, he refers to Avicenna to state that if someone harms a most excellent man (*multum excellens persona*), then only sorrow can come and not anger.¹⁰⁴ Scholarios chooses to cite only the latter but without naming Avicenna, though preserving the meaning of his words in full: “εἰ μὴ πολὺ ὑπερέχει τὸ τὴν βλάβην ὑπενηγούχος πρόσωπον· τότε γὰρ λύπη μόνον ἀκολουθεῖ.”¹⁰⁵

Based on the aforementioned examples, in the *Synopsis of Summa Theologiae* Scholarios' practice of avoiding for the most part direct references to philosophers in the Islamic world, even when he uses or comments on their arguments is debatable, if nothing else. Although Scholarios' practice in the *Synopsis of Summa Theologiae* is to avoid the names of Islamic philosophers even while using or commenting on their arguments, we should still give him credit for his attempt to widen the field of philosophy that traditionally interested Byzantine thinkers; this practice enriched philosophical thought in late Byzantium. In particular, he studies Aquinas' philosophy in depth and often resorts to his sources. However, the views of Arabic philosophers – at least in the *Synopsis of Summa Theologiae* – are perceived through Aquinas, without Scholarios providing evidence from the study of the original sources; this practice requires attention and interpretation on our part, in order to understand the transmission of Arabic philosophy in late Byzantium. Scholarios summarises and comments on many of the passages where Aquinas refers to Avicenna and Averroes, but only indirectly for the most part. Vasileios Tatakis' conclusion that Scholarios was familiar with the

101 Aquinas, *ST* Ia q. 110, a. 2, co.

102 *Et ideo melius dicendum est* (*ST* Ia q. 117, a. 3, ad 2).

103 Aquinas, *ST*, Ia-IIae q. 39 a. 3 arg. 1 - Ia-IIae q. 39 a. 3 ad 3 ; Miner 2009, 269. Aquinas, *ST*, Ia-IIae q. 39 a. 3 arg. 1 - Ia-IIae q. 39 a. 3 ad 3; Miner 2009, 269.

104 Unde si fuerit multum excellens persona quae nocumentum intulit, non sequitur ira, sed solum tristitia (*ST* Ia-IIae q. 46, a. 1, co). *Unde si fuerit multum excellens persona quae nocumentum intulit, non sequitur ira, sed solum tristitia* (*ST* Ia-IIae q. 46, a. 1, co).

105 Scholar., *Des passions*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1933, vol. VI, p. 48, 34–35. Scholar., *Des passions*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1933, vol. VI, p. 48, 34–35.

work of Avicenna and Averroes is misleading and due to a lack of attentiveness.¹⁰⁶ A few and recurring references to philosophers of the Arabic tradition do not prove a significant familiarity with their work.

Yet, Scholarios did present himself as a perspicacious reader of Arabic and Western Medieval philosophy, lending some credibility to Tatakis' claims. As we saw earlier in this paper, Scholarios, in his dedicatory epistle to Contantine Paleologus,¹⁰⁷ boasted about his erudition and claimed that he had read all the works of Avicenna, Averroes and other Arab and Persian philosophers. Even modern researchers are mislead by Scholarios' words and believe that he appreciated Averroes because he had studied his philosophy.¹⁰⁸ However, we should bear in mind that Scholarios was primarily a devout Orthodox Christian who wished to defend his religion. He considered Aristotelian philosophy to be compatible with Christian religion, although he admitted that Aristotle committed grave errors from a Christian point of view.¹⁰⁹

In the *Synopsis of Summa Theologiae* it is obvious that Scholarios agrees with Aquinas and shares the latter's views on Avicenna's and Averroes' positions. This does not necessarily indicate Scholarios' inability to process the large number of ideas presented in Aquinas' text. Agreement is the more to be expected, especially when Aquinas and Scholarios felt that the Christian dogma was at stake. In the majority of the comments, Aquinas and Scholarios, primarily as theologians, disagree with philosophers in the Islamic world or agree with each other, given that Avicenna's and Averroes' views are opposite to or subversive of Christian doctrines. In many cases, however, Scholarios did not hesitate to deviate from Aquinas when he felt that there was a doctrinal distance between them. Yet one could argue that Scholarios faithfully followed the structure of Aquinas' text and, as a result, his references to Avicenna and Averroes are not really intentional. I would argue that this can not be true precisely because Scholarios focused on passages that drew his attention and seemed to interest him. Moreover, he researched Aquinas' sources in order to broaden his philosophical scope and obtain a deeper understanding of the latter's philosophy, while he avoids the parts that point up their differences. Crucially, however, while Aquinas and Scholarios frequently named their sources, the latter avoided citing the Arabic philosophers. Aquinas is undoubtedly more careful and methodical in the use of his sources than Scholarios. However, in many parts of the *Synopsis of Summa Theologiae*, Scholarios mentions by name the sources of Aquinas he uses, regardless whether they concern Christian or secular philosophers. His persistence in avoiding extensive references to Arabic philosophers certainly has a reason.

The explanation of the problem is most probably related with Scholarios' two roles as a theologian and a philosopher. Although Scholarios held that Averroes was the

¹⁰⁶ Tatakis 2003, 248.

¹⁰⁷ Scholar., *Épître dédicatoire*, pp. 1–6 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

¹⁰⁸ Mavroudi 2006, 67.

¹⁰⁹ Mariev 2014b, 117.

best commentator of Aristotle and an original philosopher of high reputation, his view on Averroes varies according to his context and purposes. For example, when Scholarios attempts to explain Pletho's heretical views, he attributes them to his education under Elissaios, follower of Averroes and of other Persian and "Arab" philosophers, thus indicating that he considered Averroes and the rest of the Arabic philosophers as heretics.¹¹⁰ In addition, he blamed the Jewish philosophers for translating the works of philosophers writing in Arabic into their language and ignoring their own Mosaic tradition. Scholarios' prejudice against the Arabic philosophers and his rare references to them may be reasonably explained as reactions to contexts where philosophy touches on theological issues. In his theological and apologetic works, mostly contained in the first four volumes of *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*,¹¹¹ Scholarios, scarcely mentions the Arabic philosophers nor does he engage with them, either directly or indirectly. The one exception is that he cites Averroes in rejecting Pletho's views.¹¹² Scholarios' aim was evidently not to defend Averroes but to slander Pletho.

Nevertheless, in the works where Scholarios translates and comments on Aquinas, as in the *Synopsis of Summa Theologiae*, his references to Arabic philosophers increase. Scholarios mentioned philosophers in the Islamic world frequently in the *Commentary on Summa contra Gentiles* (Επιτομή τοῦ κατά Ἐθνικῶν)¹¹³ but less in his translation of Aquinas' Commentary on Aristotle's *On the soul* (Εἰς τὴν Περὶ ψυχῆς πραγματείαν Ἀριστοτέλους ἐξήγησις τοῦ Θωμᾶ ἐρμηνευθείσα παρά Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου).¹¹⁴ It is in his translation and commentary on *De ente et Essentia*,¹¹⁵ where his references to Arabic philosophers, direct or indirect, multiply; Scholarios there follows Aquinas' text faithfully, mentioning Arabic philosophers extensively. This however is the result of Aquinas' original choice. Furthermore, Scholarios comments on Aristotle's works concerning logic and natural philosophy, while at the same time, motivated by his study of them, he composes his own works. In these works the image of Arabic philosophers is mixed. Especially in his comments on Porphyry's *Introduction* and Aristotle's *Categories* (Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου Προλεγόμενα εἰς τὴν Λογικήν καὶ εἰς τὴν Πορφύριου Εἰσαγωγήν, ἐκ διαιφόρων συλλεγέντα βιβλίων, μετά ίδιων

¹¹⁰ Ragia 2013, 252.

¹¹¹ L. Petit et al ed. *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*, Paris 1928–1936, vol. I–IV.

¹¹² Scholar., *La Polémique*, p. 4 Petit/Siderides/Jugie; Scholar., *Lettre à la Princesse*, p. 153, 1 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

¹¹³ Scholar., *Résumé de la Somme contre les Gentils*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1931, vol. V, pp. 1–338.

¹¹⁴ Scholar., *Traduction du commentaire de Saint Thomas d'Aquin du "De Anima" d'Aristote*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1933, vol. VI, pp. 327–581.

¹¹⁵ Scholar., *Traduction du commentaire de l'Opuscule*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1933, vol. VI, pp. 154–326.

ἐπιστασιῶν. Εἰς πόσα χρήσιμος ἔστιν ἡ φιλοσοφία),¹¹⁶ Scholarios uses Averroes in some places, Avicenna in noticeably fewer, which would agree with his view that Averroes was the best commentator of Aristotle. Avicenna is not as important for Scholarios, although Avicenna's work on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* was of seminal importance for Western medieval philosophers. Where Scholarios seems to surpass himself is in his commentary of Aristotle's *Physics* and in his translation of Aquinas' commentary on the *Physics* (Διαιρέσις κεφαλαιώδης τῶν βιβλίων τῆς Φυσικῆς Ἀκροάσεως ἀρίστη καὶ θαυμασιωτάτη, δι' ἣς καὶ ἡ τοῦ Φιλοσόφου σοφία δείκνυται τοῦ οὗτω τάξαντος τά αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀγχίνοια τῶν καὶ διελόντων καὶ ἐκθεμένων ἐνταῦθα, ὡς ὄραται, πρὸς γνώσιν εύσύνοπτον),¹¹⁷ where his references are multiple, again mainly to Averroes and less to Avicenna. A careful examination of the text, even at primary level, does not leave much room for misinterpretation. Scholarios himself admits that many of these references have been drawn from Aquinas' texts, especially those with introductions; Averroes' frequent presence in the commentaries of the first five books of *Physics*, could be interpreted as a result of his study of Aquinas' commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*. It is obvious from the comparison of the two works that Scholarios had direct access to Aquinas' text when composing his own commentary.¹¹⁸ A first collation of Scholarios' and Aquinas' texts is quite convincing on this matter.

To sum up, Pletho shared the views of the majority of Italian humanists who held that Arabic readings of Aristotle are defective and misleading. On the other hand, although Scholarios had not studied the Arabic commentators in depth, he did realise the value of Arabic philosophy. From the viewpoint of the *Synopsis of Summa Theologia*, Scholarios does not appear to form his own argumentation against the Arabic philosophers. Rather he seems to be dependent on Aquinas for his knowledge of the thought of Avicenna and Averroes. His texts do not support his claim that, besides Avicenna and Averroes, he had studied “the philosophy of many other Arab and Persian philosophers.”¹¹⁹ I was able to find four references to Avicebron and just a single one to al-Ghazali, but I have not yet identified his sources for these. Scholarios' knowledge of Arabic philosophy was general and superficial. Nevertheless, despite any objections Scholarios might have had to the value of Arabic philosophy and its compatibility with Orthodox Christianity, he did realise that the development of Byzantine Aristotelian-

¹¹⁶ Scholar., *Prolégomènes à la Logique*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1936, vol. VII, pp. 7–113; Scholar., *Commentaire du livre*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1936, vol. VII, pp. 114–237.

¹¹⁷ Scholar., *Division sommaire*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1936, vol. VIII, pp. 1–133; Scholar., *Prolégomènes à la Physique*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1936, vol. VIII, pp. 134–162; Scholar., *Traduction du commentaire de S. Thomas d'Aquin du "De physico auditu "d'Aristote.*”, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie, Paris 1936, vol. VIII, pp. 163–254.

¹¹⁸ Steiris and Lyckoura 2013, 2013.

¹¹⁹ Scholar., *Épître dédicatoire*, p. 3, 18 Petit/Siderides/Jugie.

ism could not be accomplished without the study of the Arabic commentaries on Aristotle's works.

In the mid 14th century Nikephoros Gregoras expressed his contempt for Arabic wisdom because he did not accept the notion that the Arabs knew and preserved Hellenic wisdom better than the Byzantines.¹²⁰ But Gregoras' knowledge of Arabic philosophy remains doubtful and uncertain. It seems that the translations of Aquinas' texts familiarized Byzantine philosophers with Arabic philosophy and boosted interest in major figures like Avicenna and Averroes. Moreover, as Mavroudi suggested, Pletho said that he had learned of certain arguments in Arabic and Scholastic philosophy by hearing, an indication that the transmission of Arabic and Scholastic philosophy did not exist only in written sources.¹²¹ Jewish intellectuals' contribution to this basic form of transmission may have been crucial. Either way, the Byzantines of the 14th and 15th century were not familiar with Arabic philosophy in the original language but only with its interpretation by Medieval Christian and Jewish thinkers. While Byzantine scholars paid attention to Arabic science and attempted translations of Arabic and Persian scientific works, they consistently refused to study systematically and engage with Arabic philosophy in their culture. Gregoras' position proves that they were aware of Arabic philosophy even before the Greek translations of Aquinas' works but rejected its validity. In a vain attempt to explain the "sudden" interest of late Byzantine scholars in Averroes, Nicetas Sinosoglou supported that

*Averroes sensed the tension between the ecumenism of the shari'a and Plato's belief in the organization of a large number of virtuous communities of limited size. Thus, Averroes points at the possibility of a universal society, presumably favored by Aristotle. Aristotle served the universalism of Averroes. He could be re-calibrated to serve the Orthodox universalism represented by Palamas.*¹²²

Sinosoglou interpreted Pletho's stance towards Averroism as an anti-Palamite reaction, since the pro-Palamites would use Averroist Aristotelianism in order to serve their panorthodox vision. Such a claim is not supported by the sources, because, to my knowledge, there is no indication that Averroes' political writings were available to Byzantine scholars or that the latter were even aware of Averroes' political philosophy. In addition, Arabic ecumenism should be credited to al-Farabi and not to Averroes, since the former was the only Medieval Islamic thinker who suggested that the ideal state should cover the inhabited part of the earth.¹²³

The truth is that in the 15th century Averroism became a crucial matter for Byzantine intellectuals, since a critical mass of scholars had at least a limited and mediated knowledge of his philosophy. The thorough study of the Scholastics led the Byzantines

¹²⁰ Mavroudi 2006, 70–71.

¹²¹ Mavroudi 2013, 198–199.

¹²² Sinosoglou 2011, 415.

¹²³ Steiris 2012, 253–261.

to realize that *Aristoteles Arabus* had a distinct place in Western schools and universities. Scholarios was the most philosophical of Byzantine scholars of his time and his philosophical interest was genuine; however, his knowledge of Scholastic philosophy and Arabic Aristotelianism was not sufficient to enable him to renew Byzantine Aristotelianism and adapt it to the needs of his time. For the most part, Byzantine scholars' reaction was uneasy or hostile, because they were not always inclined or ready to study and appreciate Arabic philosophy. They felt that they were obliged to defend their interpretation of Aristotelian philosophy, which was the only accurate and authentic interpretation, inasmuch as they were the privileged inheritors of Greek wisdom. They failed to realize that the major threat to Greek culture was not Arabic and Scholastic philosophy but their very reluctance to revise, renew and enrich their traditional points of view.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abbreviations

PG	<i>Patrologiae cursus Completus. Series graeca.</i> Jacques Paul Migne (editor). Vol. 1–161. Paris 1800–1875.
ST	<i>Summa theologiae.</i>
SG	<i>Summa contra Gentiles.</i>

Primary Sources

Aquinas, Th. *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis Opera omnia iussu impensaque Leonis XIII P. M. edita: Pars prima Summae theologiae.* Vol. 4–5, Romae 1888–1889.

Aquinas, Th. *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis Opera omnia iussu impensaque Leonis XIII P. M. edita: Prima secundae Summae theologiae.* Vol. 6–7, Romae 1891–1892.

Averroes, *Averrois Cordubensis Commentarium Magnum in Aristotelis "De Anima" libros.* In S. Crawford (editor): Averroes' Aristotle, Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi, Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem series – versio Latina vol. VI, 1), Cambridge MA 1953.

Avicenna, *Al-Ilahiyāt Min Al-Shifā’.* In M. E. Marmura (editor and translator), The Metaphysics of The Healing : a parallel English-Arabic text = al-Ilahiyāt min al-Shifā’, Provo 2005.

Byzantius, Nicetas. *Confutatio falsi libri quem Scripsit Mohamedes Arabs.* Άνατροπή τῆς παρά τοῦ Ἀραβὸς Μωάμετ πλαστογράφησης Βίβλου. In Jacques Paul Migne (editor): *Patrologiae cursus Completus. Series graeca.* T. 105, Paris 1862. Cols. 669–806.

Ficino, M. Platonic Theology. In W. R. Bowen, and J. Hankins (editors): Marsilio Ficino, Platonic Theology. Vol. 5, Cambridge M. A. 2002.

Plethon, G. *Contra Scholarii defensionem Aristotelis. Γεωργίου τοῦ Γεμιστοῦ πρός τάς ύπέρ Αριστοτέλους Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἀντιλήψεις.* In J. P. Migne (editor): *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca.* T. 160, Paris 1866. Cols: 980–1020.

Plethon, G. *De differentiis.* In B. Lagarde, *Le De differentiis de Pléthon d'après l'autographe de la Marcienne, Byzantion 43* (1973), 321–343.

Plethon, G. *Traité des vertus*. Περὶ ἀρετῶν. In B. Tambrun-Krasker (editor-translator): *Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi – Philosophi Byzantini*, Brill 1987.

Scholarios, G. *Commentaires des ouvrages d'Aristote*. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. VII, Paris 1936, 7–509.

Scholarios, G. *Commentaire du livre des Catégories d'Aristote*. Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου εἰς τὸ βιβλίον τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Κατηγοριῶν ἐξήγησις. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. VII, Paris 1936, 114–237.

Scholarios, G. *Des habitudes et des vertus*. Ἐντεῦθεν περὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἐνεργειῶν καὶ πρῶτον περὶ τῶν ἔνδοθεν. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. VI, Paris 1933, 51–76.

Scholarios, G. *Des passions*. Περὶ τῶν παθῶν τῆς ψυχῆς γενικώτερον. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. VI, Paris 1933, 27–51.

Scholarios, G. *Division sommaire des cinq premiers livres de la Physique d'Aristote*. Διαιρέσις κεφαλαίωδης τῶν βιβλίων τῆς Φυσικῆς Ἀκροάσεως ἀρίστη καὶ θαυμασιωτάτη, δ' ἡς καὶ ἡ τοῦ Φιλοσόφου σοφία δείκνυται τοῦ οὔτω τάξαντος τά αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀγχίνοια τῶν καὶ διελόντων καὶ ἔκθεμένων ἐνταῦθα, ὡς ὄραται, προς γνώσιν εύσύνοπτον. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. VIII, Paris 1936, 1–133.

Scholarios, G. *Épître dédicatoire à Constantin Paléologue*. Τῷ ύψηλοτάτῳ καὶ πανευτυχεστάτῳ δεσπότῃ κύρῳ Κωνσταντίνῳ τῷ Παλαιολόγῳ. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. VII, Paris 1936, 1–6.

Scholarios, G. *Extraits de la Somme contre les Gentils*. Ὄτι οὐκ ἔξ ἀϊδου ἡ κτίσης. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. V, Paris 1931, 381–383.

Scholarios, G. *La Polémique contre Gémistos Pléthon, Contre les difficultés de Pléthon au sujet d'Aristote*. ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΣΧΟΛΑΡΙΟΥ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΠΛΗΘΩΝΟΣ ΑΠΟΡΙΩΝ ΕΠ' ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΕΙ. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres Completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. IV, Paris 1935, 1–116.

Scholarios, G. *Lettre à la princesse du Péloponèse sur le "Traité des lois" de Gémistos Pléthon (1454–1456)*. Γενναδίου ταπεινοῦ: ἐπιστολὴ τῇ βασιλίσσῃ περὶ τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ Γεμιστοῦ. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. IV, Paris 1935, 151–155.

Scholarios, G. *Prolégomènes à la Logique et à l'*Isagoge* de Porphyre, Utilité de la Philosophie*. Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου Προλεγόμενα εἰς τὴν Λογικήν καὶ εἰς τὴν Πορφυρίου Εισαγωγήν, ἐκ διαφόρων συλλεγέντα βιβλίων, μετά ιδίων ἐπιστασιών. Εἰς πόσα χρήσιμος ἐστίν ἡ φιλοσοφία. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. VII, Paris 1936, 7–113.

Scholarios, G. *Prolégomènes à la Physique d'Aristote tirés de divers auteurs*. Προλεγόμενα ἡ προθεωρούμενα. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. VIII, Paris 1936, 134–162.

Scholarios, G. *Résumé de la "Prima Secundae" de la Somme théologique de saint Thomas d'Aquin*. Ἐκλογὴ τοῦ πρώτου τῶν Ἡθικῶν τοῦ σοφιώτατου Θωμᾶ Ἀκίνο, τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ καὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν ζητημάτων πάντων πεφυλαγμένων. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. VI, Paris 1933, 1–153.

Scholarios, G. *Résumé de la Somme contre les Gentils de Saint Thomas d'Aquin*. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. V, Paris 1931, 1–338.

Scholarios, G. *Résumé de la Somme théologique de saint Thomas d'Aquin*. Ἐκ τοῦ Θεολογικοῦ. Ἐκ τῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀποσημειώσεις τινές. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres completes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. V, Paris 1931, 338–510.

Scholarios, G. *Traduction du commentaire de l'opuscule de saint Thomas d'Aquin: "De ente et Essentia."* Τοῦ Θωμᾶ περὶ διάφορας ούσιας καὶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐρμηνευθέν καὶ πρός τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετενεχθέν γλώτταν παρά Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. VI, Paris 1933, 154–326.

Scholarios, G. *Traduction du commentaire de saint Thomas d'Aquin du "De Anima" d'Aristote. Eἰς τὴν Περὶ ψυχῆς πραγματείαν Ἀριστοτέλους ἔξηγησις τοῦ Θωμᾶ ἐρμηνευθείσα παρά Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου*. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. VI, Paris 1933, 327–581.

Scholarios, G. *Traduction du commentaire de S. Thomas d'Aquin du "De physico Auditu" d'Aristote. Προλεγόμενα ἥ προθεωρούμενα*. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. VIII, Paris 1936, 163–254.

Scholarios, G. *Traité de la création corporelle. Περὶ τῆς δημιουργίας τῆς σωματικῆς κτίσεως*. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. V, Paris 1931, 416–431.

Scholarios, G. *Traité de la création en général. Νῦν περὶ τῆς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ προόδου τῶν κτισμάτων*. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. V, Paris 1931, 378–390.

Scholarios, G. *Traité de l'homme. Περὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ψυχῆς καθ' αὐτήν*. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. V, Paris 1931, 431–480.

Scholarios, G. *Traité de la Trinité. Νῦν περὶ τῶν ἀνηκόντων τῇ Τριάδι τῶν Θείων προσώπων*. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. V, Paris 1931, 368–378.

Scholarios, G. *Traité du gouvernement divin. Περὶ τῆς τῶν ὄντων κυβερνήσεως κοινᾶς*. In L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (editors): *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios*. Vol. V, Paris 1931, 480–510.

Secondary Sources

Anastos, M. V. (1948). "Pletho's Calendar and Liturgy". In: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 4, pp. 183–305.

Barbour, H. C. (1993b). *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios and His Translation of the Commentary of Armandus de Bellovisu on the "De Ente Ed Essentia" of Thomas Aquinas*. Città del Vaticano.

Berger, A. (2006). "Plethon in Italien". In: *Der Beitrag der Byzantinischen Gelehrten zur Abendländischen Renaissance des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts*. Ed. by E. Konstantinou. Frankfurt am Main, pp. 79–89.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2008e). *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472): un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'empire byzantin*. Paris.

Blum, P. R. (2010). *Philosophy of Religion in the Renaissance*. Farnham.

Bowen, W. R. and J. Hankins (2002). *Marsilio Ficino, Platonic Theology*. Vol. 2. Cambridge M. A.

Burrel, D. (2012). "Aquinas and Jewish and Islamic Authors". In: *The Oxford Handbook of Aquinas*. Ed. by B. Davies and E. Stump. Oxford, pp. 65–76.

Crawford, F. S. (1963). "Averrois Cordubensis Commentarium Magnum in Aristotelis 'De Anima' libros." In: *Averroes' Aristotle, Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi, Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem series - versio Latina*. Vol. VI, 1. Cambridge MA, pp. 383–413.

Davidson, H. (1992). *Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes, on Intellect: Their Cosmologies, Theories of the Active Intellect, and Theories of Human Intellect*. Oxford.

De Boer, S. (2013). *The Science of the Soul: The Commentary Tradition on Aristotle's De Anima, c. 1260–c. 1360*. Leuven.

Dedes, D. (1985). "Die Wichtigsten Gründe der Apostasie des Georgios Gemistos (Plethon)". In: *Filosofia* 15, pp. 352–375.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2002a). "Georgios Gennadios II – Scholarios' *Florilegium Thomisticum*. His Early Abridgment of Various Chapters and Quaestiones of Thomas Aquinas' Summae and his anti-Plethonism". In: *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévale* 69.1, pp. 117–171.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2006c). "Georgios Gemistos-Plethon's Dependence on Thomas Aquinas' *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Summa Theologiae*". In: *Archiv für mittelalterliche Philosophie und Kultur* 12, pp. 276–341.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2014a). "Commission VIII: Byzantine Philosophy, Section 2: Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus". In: *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 56, pp. 13–22.

Donato, A. (2006). "Aquinas' Theory of Happiness and its Greek, Byzantine, Latin and Arabic Sources". In: *Al-Masâq* 18, pp. 161–189.

El Cheikh, N. M. (2004). *Byzantium Viewed by the Arabs*. Cambridge MA.

Fink, J. L. (2011). "Pletho's Criticism of Aristotle's Virtues: A Note on *De differentiis* 12". In: *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 51.3, pp. 483–497.

Gardette, P. (2007). "Pour en finir avec Pléthon et son maître juif Elisée". In: *Etudes imagologiques et relations interconfessionnelles en zone Byzantino-Ottomane*. Ed. by P. Gardette. Istanbul, pp. 147–164.

Gutas, D. (1998). *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture: the Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early Abbasid Society, 2nd – 4th / 8th – 10th Centuries*. London and New York.

Gutas, D. (2012). "Arabic into Byzantine Greek: Introducing a Survey of the Translations". In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissenformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 36. Berlin and Boston, pp. 246–265.

Hladký, V. (2014). *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon. Platonism in Late Byzantium, between Hellenism and Orthodoxy*. Farnham and Burlington.

Jokisch, B. (2007). *Islamic Imperial Law*. Berlin.

Karamanolis, G. (2002b). "Plethon and Scholarios on Aristotle". In: *Byzantine Philosophy and its Ancient Sources*. Ed. by K. Ierodiakonou. Oxford, pp. 253–282.

Kristeller, P. O. (1993). "Renaissance Platonism". In: *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*. Vol. 3. Roma, pp. 3–20.

Lagarde, B. (1973). "Le *De differentiis* de Pléthon d' après l' autographe de la Marcienne". In: *Byzantion* 43, pp. 312–343.

Leaman, O. (1988). *Averroes and His Philosophy*. Oxford.

Livanos, C. (2006b). *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios: Alone Against All of Europe*. New Jersey.

Mariev, S. (2014b). "Plethon and Scholarios on Deliberation in Art and Nature". In: *Georgios Gemistos Plethon The Byzantine and the Latin Renaissance*. Ed. by J. Matula and P. R. Blum. Olomouc, pp. 113–142.

Markov, S. (2012). "Theodor `Abû Qurra als Nachfolger des Johannes von Damaskus". In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissenformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 36. Berlin and Boston, pp. 111–122.

Martin, C. (2014). *Subverting Aristotle: Religion, History, and Philosophy in Early Modern Science*. Baltimore.

Masai, F. (1956). *Pléthon et le Platonisme de Mistra*. Paris.

Masai, F. (1971). "Plethon, l' Averroïsme et le problème religieux". In: *Actes du colloque international sur le néoplatonisme*. Ed. by P. M. Schul and P. Hadot. Paris, pp. 435–446.

Matula, J. (2014). "The Fate of Plethon's Criticism of Averroës". In: *Georgios Gemistos Plethon: The Byzantine and the Latin Renaissance. Acts of the Conference "Georgios Gemistos Plethon: The*

Byzantine and the Latin Renaissance, Olomouc, 10–12 May 2013, ed. by J. Matula and P. R. Blum. Olomouc, pp. 293–322.

Mavroudi, M. (2006). “Occult Science and Society in Byzantium: Considerations for Future Research”. In: *The Occult Sciences in Byzantium*. Ed. by P. Magdalino and M. Mavroudi. Geneva, pp. 39–96.

Mavroudi, M. (2007). “Late Byzantium and Exchange with Arabic Writers”. In: *Byzantium, Faith and Power (1261–1557). Perspectives on Late Byzantine Art and Culture. The Metropolitan Museum of Art Symposia*. Ed. by S. T. Brooks. New Haven, Connecticut, pp. 62–75.

Mavroudi, M. (2013). “Plethon as a Subversive and His Reception in the Islamic World”. In: *Power and Subversion in Byzantium. Papers from the 43rd Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 2010*. Ed. by D. Angelov and M. Saxby. Farnham: Publications of the Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 17, pp. 177–204.

Mavroudi, M. (2014). “Ελληνική φιλοσοφία στην αυλή του Μωάμεθ Β΄”. In: *Byzantina* 33, pp. 151–182.

Mavroudi, M. (2015). “Translations from Greek into Arabic and Latin during the Middle Ages: Searching for the Classical Tradition”. In: *Speculum* 90.1, pp. 28–59.

Mercier, R. (2003). “The Sources of the Astronomy of Gemistos Plethon”. In: *Proceedings of the International Congress of Plethon and His Time, Mystras, 26–29 June 2002, Athens*. Mystras.

Meyendorff, J. (1982). *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church*. Crestwood.

Miner, R. (2009). *Thomas Aquinas on the Passions*. New York.

Monfasani, J. (2002a). “Marsilio Ficino and the Plato-Aristotle controversy”. In: *Marsilio Ficino: His Theology, His Philosophy, His Legacy*. Ed. by M. J. B. Allen, V. Rees, and M. Davies. Leiden, pp. 179–202.

Nicolet, J. and M. Tardieu (1980). “Pletho Arabicus Identification et Contenu du Manuscrit Arabe d'Istanbul, Topkapi Serai. Ahmet III 1896”. In: *Journal Asiatique* 268, pp. 35–57.

Nikolaidou-Kyrianidou, E. (1992). *O πολιτικός κατά τον Γεώργιο Γεμιστό-Πλήθωνα. Είναι πλατωνική η κατά Πλήθωνα πολιτική φιλοσοφία*; Athens.

Nikolaidou-Kyrianidou, E. (2006). “La cité des frères: La polis parfaite de Platon et la Jérusalem du Christianisme”. In: *Parenté et société dans le monde grec de l'Antiquité à l'Âge moderne (colloque international. Volos (Grèce) 19–20–21 juin 2003*. Ed. by A. Bresson. Bordeaux.

Noble, S. and A. Treiger (2011). “Christian Arabic Theology in Byzantine Antioch: ‘Abdallâh ibn al-Fadl al-‘Antâkî and his Discourse on the Holy Trinity”. In: *Le Muséon* 124.3–4, pp. 371–417.

Pagani, F. (2009). “*Damnata verba*: censure di Pletoni in alcuni codici platonici”. In: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 102, pp. 167–202.

Plested, M. (2012f). *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*. Oxford.

Ragia, E. (2013). “Review of M. H. Blanchet, *Georges Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400 – vers 1472). Un Intellectuel Orthodoxe Face à la Disparition de l'Empire Byzantin*, Archives de l' Orient Chretien 20, Paris, 2008”. In: *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 58.1–4, pp. 241–258.

Ross, J. (2016). “Elijah Delmedigo”. In: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. by E. N. Zalta. Summer 2016 Edition. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2016/entries/delmedigo/>.

Siniossoglou, N. (2011). *Radical Platonism in Byzantium: Illumination and Utopia in Gemistos Plethon*. Cambridge.

Siniossoglou, N. (2012). “Sect and Utopia in Shifting Empires: Plethon, Elissaios, Bedreddin”. In: *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 36.1, pp. 38–55.

Steiris, G. (2012). “Al-Farabi's Ecumenical State and its Modern Connotations”. In: *Skepsis* 22.3, pp. 253–261.

Steiris, G. and N. Lyckoura (2013). “La perception et valorization de la philosophie arabe dans le Résumé de la Somme théologique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin de Georges Gennade Scholarios:

les cas d'Avicenne et Averroès". In: *Marges de la Philosophie Byzantine*. Ed. by G. Arabatzis. Athens, pp. 51–74.

Täschner, F. (1929). "Georgios Gemistos Plethon, ein Beitrag zur Frage der Übertragung von Islamischem Geistesgut nach dem Abendlande". In: *Der Islam* 18, pp. 236–243.

Täschner, F. (1929–1930). "Georgios Gemistos Plethon ein Vermittler Zwischen Morgenland und Abendland zu Beginn der Renaissance". In: *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher* 8, pp. 100–113.

Tatakis, V. (2003). *Byzantine Philosophy*. Ed. by N. Moutafakis. Indianapolis.

Taylor, R. (2012). "Aquinas and 'the Arabs': Arabic / Islamic Philosophy in Thomas Aquinas's Conception of the Beatific Vision in his Commentary on the Sentences IV, 49, 2, 1". In: *The Thomist* 76, pp. 509–505.

Taylor, R. (2013). "Aquinas and the Arabs: Aquinas's First Critical Encounter with the Doctrine of Averroes on the Intellect, In 2 Sent. d. 17, q. 2, a. 1". In: *Philosophical Psychology in Arabic Thought and the Latin Aristotelianism of the 13th Century*. Ed. by L. X. López-Farjeat and J. Tellkamp. Paris, pp. 142–183, 277–296.

Tischler, M. (2012). "Eine fast vergessene Gedächtnisspur. Der byzantinisch-lateinische Wissentransfer zum Islam (8.–13. Jahrhundert)". In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissenformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 36. Berlin and Boston, pp. 167–195.

Turner, C. J. G. (1969b). "The Career of George Gennadius Scholarius". In: *Byzantion* 39, pp. 424–425.

Versteegh, K. (2013). "History of Arabic Language Teaching". In: *Handbook for Arabic Language Teaching Professionals in the 21st Century*. Ed. by K. Wahba, Z. Taha, and L. England. London, pp. 3–13.

Von Grunebaum, G. (1964). "Parallelism, Convergence, and Influence in the Relations of Arab and Byzantine Philosophy, Literature and Piety". In: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 18, pp. 89–111.

Woodhouse, C. M. (1986). *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes*. Oxford.

Wright, C. (2013a). "Towards an Edition of Demetrios Kydones's Autograph Translation of Thomas Aquinas' ST, Prima Pars". In: *When East Met West: the Reception of Latin Theological and Philosophical Thought in Late Byzantium, Acts of the Institute of Classical Studies Intl. Byzantine Colloquium, London, 11–12 June 2012*. Ed. by J. Demetracopoulos and C. Dendrinos. Nicolaus, pp. 15–30.

Selected Bibliography

Aerts, W. (1986). "Proverbial Passages Taken from Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum Doctrinale* Translated into Medieval Greek: The Methods of Translation Used by the Anonymous Greek Author". In: *Vincent of Beauvais and Alexander the Great*. Ed. by W. J. Aerts, E. R. Smits, and J. Voorbij. Groningen, pp. 141–176.

Anastos, M. V. (1948). "Pletho's Calendar and Liturgy". In: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 4, pp. 183–305.

Argyriou, A. (1986). "Les écrits anti'islamique de Macaire Makrès". In: *Macaire Makrès et la polémique contre l'Islam: édition princeps de l'éloge de Macaire Makrès et de ses deux oeuvres anti'islamiques précédée d'une étude critique*. Ed. by A. Argyriou. Studi e Testi 314. Vatican, pp. 57–94.

Athanasiopoulos, P. C. *Loci diversi ex Thomae de Aquino scriptis apud Bessarionis opera*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca. Appendix to J. Monfasani (ed.), *Ioannis Gatti Notata in libro secundo Georgii Trapezuntii "Comparationis Philosophorum"* (forthcoming). Turnhout.

Athanasiopoulos, P. C. (2015). "Scholarios against Plethon on Philosophy vs. Myth". In: *The Ways of Byzantine Philosophy*. Ed. by M. Knežević. Alhambra, pp. 401–427.

Athanasiopoulos, P. C. (2017c). "Ways of Reception of Thomas Graecus and Thomas Latinus in Bessarion's Writings". In: *Bessarion's Treasure*. Ed. by S. Mariev. Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica 3. Forthcoming.

Balcoyiannopoulou, I. (2017). "New Evidence on the Manuscript Tradition and on the Latin and Greek Background to George Scholarius' In 'De Interpretatione'". In: *Never the Twain Shall Meet?* Ed. by D. Searby. Berlin and Boston, 93–113 in this volume.

Baloglou, C. (1996). "Ἡ οἰκονομικὴ σκέψη τοῦ Νικολάου Καβάσιλα". In: *Bučančiačáká* 16, pp. 193–213.

Barbalarga, D. (1984). "Un documento inedito su Giorgio da Trebisonda: La donazione di tre sue opere al convento della Minerva di Roma". In: *Pluteus* 2, pp. 159–162.

Barbour, H. C. (1993a). *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios and His Translation of the Commentary of Armandus de Bellovisu on the "De Ente Ed Essentia" of Thomas Aquinas*. Studi Tomistici 53. Vatican City.

Barnes, M. R. (1995a). "Augustine in Contemporary Trinitarian Theology". In: *Theological Studies* 56, pp. 237–325.

Barnes, M. R. (1995b). "De Régnon Reconsidered". In: *Augustinian Studies* 26, pp. 51–79.

Bazán, B. C. (1997). "The Human Soul: Form and Substance? Thomas Aquinas' Critique of Eclectic Aristotelianism". In: *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 64, pp. 95–126.

Beatrice, P. (2013). *The Transmission of Sin: Augustine and the Pre-Augustinian Sources*. Oxford.

Beck, H. G. (1959). *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*. München.

Berger, A. (1953). "Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law". In: *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 43.2.

Berger, A. (2006). "Plethon in Italien". In: *Der Beitrag der Byzantinischen Gelehrten zur Abendländischen Renaissance des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts*. Ed. by E. Konstantinou. Frankfurt am Main, pp. 79–89.

Berschin, W. (1980). *Griechisch-lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern.

Bianca, C. (1999). "Gaza, Teodoro". In: *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*. Vol. 52. Roma, pp. 737–746.

Bianconi, D. (2005). "Gregorio Palamas e oltre". Qualche riflessioni su cultura profana, libri e pratiche intellettuali nella controversia palamitica". In: *Medioevo greco* 5, pp. 93–119.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2001b). "Georges Gennadios Scholarios a-t-il été trois fois patriarche de Constantinople?" In: *Byzantium* 71, pp. 60–72.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2008b). *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400 – vers 1472): Un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'empire byzantin*. Archives de l'orient chrétien, 20. Paris.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2012). “Éliminer Thomas d'Aquin: le projet antithomiste de Matthieu Ange Panarétos”. In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*, 37. Kölner Mediaevistentagung, Köln 14–17 September 2010. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 36. Berlin, pp. 452–465.

Blanchet, M.-H. (2016). “Atoumès, un nouveau traducteur byzantin de Thomas d'Aquin”. In: *Koinotaton doron. Das späte Byzanz zwischen Machtlosigkeit und kultureller Blüte (1204–1461)*. Ed. by A. Berger et al. Byzantinisches Archiv, 31. Berlin, pp. 17–37.

Blum, P. R. (2010). *Philosophy of Religion in the Renaissance*. Farnham.

Boojamra, J. (1976). “Original Sin According to St. Maximus the Confessor”. In: *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 20, pp. 19–31.

Bowen, W. R. and J. Hankins (2002). *Marsilio Ficino, Platonic Theology*. Vol. 2. Cambridge M. A.

Bradshaw, D. (2004). *Aristotle East and West*. Cambridge.

Brower, J. E. (2014). *Aquinas's Ontology of the Material World: Change, Hylomorphism, and Material Objects*. Oxford.

Buckland, W. (1931). *The Main Institution of Roman Private Law*. New York.

Bucossi, A. (2012). “Dibattiti teologici alla corte di Manuele Comneno”. In: *Vie per Bizanzio: VII Congresso dell'Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini, Venezia 25–28 novembre 2009*. Ed. by A. Rigo, A. Babuin, and M. Trizio. Bari, pp. 312–314.

Bucossi, A. (2016). “The six dialogues of Niketas ‘of Maroneia’: A Contextualising Introduction”. In: *Dialogue and Debate from Late Antiquity to Late Byzantium*. Ed. by A. Cameron and N. Gaul. Burlington, pp. 137–152.

Bucur, B. (2008). “Foreordained from All Eternity: The Mystery of the Incarnation According to Some Early Christian and Byzantine Writers”. In: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 62, pp. 199–215.

Buda, C. (1956). “Influsso del tomismo a Bisanzio nel secolo XIV”. In: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 49, pp. 318–331.

Bulgakov, S. (1988). *The Orthodox Church*. London.

Bulgakov, S. (1997). “The Holy Grail and the Eucharist”. In: ed. by B. Jakim. Hudson NY, pp. 76–83.

Burrel, D. (2012). “Aquinas and Jewish and Islamic Authors”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Aquinas*. Ed. by B. Davies and E. Stump. Oxford, pp. 65–76.

Bydén, B. (2004). “‘Strangle them with these meshes of syllogisms!’ Latin philosophy in Greek translations of the thirteenth century”. In: *Interaction and isolation in late Byzantine culture*. Ed. by J. O. Rosenqvist. Uppsala, pp. 133–165.

Bynum, C. W. (1995). *The Resurrection of the Body*. New York.

Cacouros, M. (2000). “Georges Scholarios et le *Paris. gr. 1932*: Jean Chortasménos, l'enseignement de la logique, le thomisme à Byzance”. In: *The Greek Script in the 15th and 16th Centuries*. Ed. by S. Patoura-Spanou. National Hellenic Research Foundation. Institute for Byzantine Research. International Symposium, 7. Athens, pp. 397–442.

Cacouros, M. (2010). “Ο Α' τόμος τῶν Ἀπάντων τῶν εὐρισκομένων τοῦ Γεωργίου Σχολαρίου: προοιμιακὸ δοκίμιο”. In: *Μεταβυζαντινὰ κείμενα. Τόμος 1: Γεννάδιος Σχολάριος, Α'*. Athens, 1*–121*.

Cacouros, M. (2013). “Ε' καὶ Ζ' τόμος τῶν Ἀπάντων τῶν εὐρισκομένων τοῦ Γεωργίου Γενναδίου Σχολαρίου. Προοιμιακὸ δοκίμιο”. In: *Μεταβυζαντινὰ κείμενα. Τόμος 5: Γεννάδιος Σχολάριος, Ε'*. Athens, 1*–172*.

Callebaut, A. (1927). “Alexandre de Halès et ses confrères en face des condamnations parisiennes de 1241 et 1244”. In: *France Franciscaine* 10, pp. 257–272.

Callus, D. (1955). *The Condemnation of St Thomas at Oxford*. 2nd ed. London.

Cameron, A. (2016). *Arguing it Out: Discussion in Twelfth-Century Byzantium*. The Natalie Zemon Davis Annual Lectures, 8. Budapest.

Candal, M. (1954). “El libro VI de Próchoro Cidonio [sobre la luz tabórica]”. In: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 20, pp. 247–296.

Candal, M. (1965). “La Virgen Santísima ‘prepurificada’ en su Anunciación”. In: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 31, pp. 241–276.

Capelle, C. (1932). *Autour du décret de 1210: Amaury de Bène*. Paris.

Cataldi Palau, A. (1995). “La biblioteca del cardinale Giovanni Salviati. Alcuni nuovi manoscritti greci in biblioteche diverse della Vaticana”. In: *Scriptorium* 49, pp. 60–95.

Cataldi Palau, A. (2008). “Un nuovo manoscritto palinsesto di Giorgio Baiophoros”. In: *Studies in Greek Manuscripts*. first published in: S. Lucà (ed.), *Libri palinsesti greci: conservazione, restauro digitale, studio Monte Porzio Catone (Villa Mondragone) – Università degli Studi di Roma “Tor Vergata” – Biblioteca del Monumento Nazionale di Grottaferrata. Atti del convegno internazionale 21–24 aprile 2004*, Rome 2008, 263–277. Spoleto, pp. 281–301.

Cavadini, J. and M. Djuth (1999). *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*. Grand Rapids.

Chenu, M.-D. (1947). “Le dernier avatar de la théologie orientale au XIIIe siècle”. In: *Mélanges Auguste Pelzer: Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale de la Scolastique médiévale offertes à Monseigneur Auguste Pelzer à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie 3, 26. Louvain, pp. 159–181.

Chenu, M.-D. (1969). “Érigène à Citeaux”. In: *La Philosophie et ses problèmes, Mélanges offerts à Mgr R. Jolivet*. Lyon and Paris, pp. 99–107.

Cheyne, J.-C. (2006). “De Tziliapert à Sébastè”. In: *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* 9, pp. 213–226.

Chiettini, E. (1955). “La prima sanctificazione di Maria Ss.ma nella scuola francescana del sec. xiii”. In: *Virgo immaculata: Acta Congressus mariologici-mariani Romae anno MCMLIV celebrati*. Ed. by C. Balić. Vol. 4. Rome, pp. 1–39.

Classen, C. J. (1993). “The Rhetorical Works of George of Trebizond and Their Debt to Cicero”. In: *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 56, pp. 75–84.

Classen, P. (1955). “Das Konzil von Konstantinopel 1166 und die Lateiner”. In: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 48, pp. 339–368.

Colish, M. L. (1995). “Early Scholastic Angelology”. In: *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 62. Reprinted in M.L. Colish, *Studies in Scholasticism*, Aldershot 2006, pp. 106–109.

Collins, A. B. (1974). *The Secular is Sacred: Platonism and Thomism in Marsilio Ficino's Platonic Theology*. The Hague.

Congourdeau, M.-H. (2004). “Nicholas Cabasilas et le Palamisme”. In: *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*. Ed. by A. Rigo. Orientalia Venetiana, 16. Florence, pp. 191–210.

Congourdeau, M.-H. (2007). *L'embryon et son âme dans les sources grecques (vie siècle av. J.-C.-ve siècle apr. J.-C.)* Collège de France –Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance. Monographies, 26. Paris.

Congourdeau, M.-H. (2009). “Nikolas Kabasilas et la théologie latine”. In: *Byzantine Theologians: The Systematization of their own Doctrine and their Perception of foreign Doctrines*. Ed. by A. Rigo and P. Ermilov. Quaderni, 3. Roma, pp. 169–179.

Constas, N. (2002a). “Mark Eugenikos”. In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition. II: XIIIe–XIXe s.* Ed. by C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello. Turnhout, pp. 411–475.

Copenhaver, B. P. (1988). “Translation, Terminology and Style in Philosophical Discourse”. In: *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*. Ed. by C. B. Schmitt and Q. a. Skinner. Cambridge, pp. 77–110.

Corbett, G. (2015). "Peraldus and Aquinas: Two Dominican Approaches to the Seven Capital Vices in the Christian Moral Life". In: *The Thomist* 79, pp. 383–406.

Cross, R. (1999). *Duns Scotus*. Oxford.

Dales, R. C. (1995). *The Problem of the Rational Soul in the Thirteenth Century*. Leiden.

D'Alverny, M.-T. (1950-1951). "Un fragment du procès des amauriens". In: *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen-Age* 18, pp. 325–336.

D'Alverny, M.-T. (1953). "Le cosmos symbolique du XI^e siècle". In: *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen-Age* 20, pp. 31–81.

Davidson, H. (1992). *Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes, on Intellect: Their Cosmologies, Theories of the Active Intellect, and Theories of Human Intellect*. Oxford.

De Andrés, G. (1965). *Catálogo des los códices griegos de la Real Biblioteca de el Escorial*. Vol. 2. Madrid.

De Boer, S. (2013). *The Science of the Soul: The Commentary Tradition on Aristotle's De Anima*, c. 1260–c. 1360. Leuven.

De Contenson, P. M. (1959). "Avicennisme latin et vision de Dieu au début du XIII^e s." In: *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen-Age* 26, pp. 29–97.

De Vaux, R. (1934). *Notes et textes sur l'Avicennisme latin aux confins du XI^e et XII^e siècles*. Paris.

Dedes, D. (1985). "Die Wichtigsten Gründe der Apostasie des Georgios Gemistos (Plethon)". In: *Filosofia* 15, pp. 352–375.

Dekkers, E. (1953). "Les traductions grecques des écrits patristiques latins". In: *Sacris Erudiri* 5, pp. 193–233.

Del Soldato, E. (2008). "Platone, Aristotele e il Cardinale: il *De natura et arte di Bessarione*". In: *Rinascimento* 48, pp. 61–79.

Del Soldato, E. (2014). "Introduzione". In: *Basilio Bessarione: Contro il calunniatore di Platone*. Ed. by E. Del Soldato. Roma, pp. IX–XXV.

Demacopoulos, G. and A. Papanikolaou (2008). "Augustine and the Orthodox: 'The West' in the East". In: *Orthodox Readings of Augustine*. Ed. by G. Demacopoulos and A. Papanikolaou. Crestwood, NY, pp. 11–40.

Demetracopoulos, J. (1997). Αύγουστῖνος καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς. Τὰ προβλήματα τῶν Ἀριστοτελικῶν κατηγοριῶν καὶ τῆς Τριαδικῆς ψυχοθεολογίας. Athens.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. "§ 1. Die Hesychastenstreit (Manuel Kalekas). (Demetrios Kydones). (Prochoros Kydones). (Georgios Scholarios – Gennadios II)". In: *Grundiss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Begründet von F. Überweg. Die Philosophie des Mittelalters. Band 1/1: Jüdische und byzantinische Philosophie. Bandteil: Byzantinische Philosophie*. Ed. by G. Kariev. Forthcoming. Chap. 8.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. "Prochoros Kydones". In: *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Begründet von Fr. Überweg. Die Philosophie des Mittelalters. Band 1/1: Jüdische und byzantinische Philosophie. Bandteil: Byzantinische Philosophie*. Ed. by G. Kapriev. Forthcoming. Basel.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (1995-1996). "A critical note on the text of St. Anselm's *Cur Deus homo* 1, 21". In: *Byzantina* 18, pp. 113–117.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (1997). Αύγουστῖνος καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς: Τὰ προβλήματα τῶν ἀριστοτελικῶν κατηγοριῶν καὶ τῆς τριαδικῆς ψυχοθεολογίας. Athens.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (1998). "Nicholas Cabasilas' Quaestio de Rationis Valore: An Anti-Palamite Defense of Secular Wisdom". In: *Byzantina* 19, pp. 53–93.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (1999). *Νικολάου Καβασιλά κατά Πύρρωνο: Πλατωνικός φιλοσοφηπτικισμός καὶ ἀριστοτελικός ἀντισκεπτικισμός*. Athens.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2004a). *Απὸ τὴν ἱστορία τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ θωματισμοῦ: Πλήθων καὶ Θωμᾶς Ἀκυνάτης*. Greek Byzantium and the Latin West: Philosophy – Studies, 2. Athens.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2004b). *Πλήθων καὶ Θωμᾶς Ἀκυνάτης: ἀπὸ τὴν ἱστορία τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ θωμισμοῦ*. Greek Byzantium and the Latin West: Philosophy – Studies 2. Athens.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2006a). “Georgios Gemistos-Plethon's Dependence on Thomas Aquinas' *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Summa Theologiae*”. In: *Archiv für mittelalterliche Philosophie und Kultur* 12, pp. 276–341.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2006d). “The *Sitz im Leben* of Demetrios Cydones' translation of Pseudo-Augustine's Soliloquia. Remarks on a recent edition”. In: *Quaestio* 6, pp. 191–258.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2007a). “Georgios Gennadios II – Scholarios' ‘Florilegium Thomisticum II’ (‘De Fato’) and its anti-Plethonic Tenor”. In: *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales* 74.2, pp. 301–376.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2010a). “Demetrios Cydones' Translation of Bernardus Guidonis' List of Thomas Aquinas' Writings and the Historical Roots of Byzantine Thomism”. In: *1308. Eine Topographie historischer Gleichzeitigkeit*. Ed. by A. Speer and D. Wirmer. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 35. Berlin and New York, pp. 827–881.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2010e). “Échos d'Orient -- Résonances d'Ouest. In Respect of: C.G. Conticello – V. Conticello, ed., *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition. II: XIIIe-XIXe S.*” In: *Nicolaus* 37, pp. 67–148.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2010f). “Palamas Transformed. Palamite Interpretations of the Distinction between God's 'Essence' and 'Energies' in Late Byzantium”. In: *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*. Ed. by M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel. *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales. Bibliotheca*, 9. Leuven, pp. 263–372.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2012b). “The Influence of Thomas Aquinas on Late Byzantine Philosophical and Theological Thought: à Propos of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus Project*”. In: *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 54, pp. 101–124.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2012d). “Thomas Aquinas' Impact on Late Byzantine Theology and Philosophy: The Issues of Method or 'Modus Sciendi' and 'Dignitas Hominis'”. In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz: Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 36. Berlin, pp. 333–410.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2014b). “Latin Philosophical Works Translated into Greek”. In: *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*. Ed. by R. Pasnau and C. van Dyke. 2nd ed. Cambridge, pp. 822–826.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2015). “Prochoros Cydones”. In: *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Christian East*. Ed. by E. G. Farrugia. Rome, pp. 582–583.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2017a). “A Cultural Aspect of 'Bessario Scholasticus': Bessarion's Self-placement between Hellenes, Greeks and Latins and the Scholastic 'Quaestio' as a Tool for Peacefully Resolving Disagreement”. In: *Bessarion's Treasure. Editing, Translating and Interpreting Bessarion's Literary Heritage*. Ed. by S. Mariev. *Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica*, 3. Forthcoming. Berlin and Boston.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2017b). “George Gennadios II – Scholarios' Abridgment of the *Parva Naturalia*: Its Place in his Œuvre and in the History of Byzantine Aristotelianism”. In: *Supplementing the Science of Soul: The “Parva Naturalia” in Greek, Arabic and Latin Aristotelianism. 2014 Conference Gothenburg, 6–8 June*. Ed. by B. Bydèn and F. Radović. *Studies in the History of Philosophy of Mind*, 17. Dordrecht.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2017d). “Philosophy and Christianity in George Scholarios – Gennadios II: An Overview of Certain Central Issues”. In: *Φιλοσοφία* (The Academy of Athens) 47. Forthcoming.

Demetracopoulos, J. A. and C. Dendrinos (2014). “Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus”. In: *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 56, pp. 13–22.

Dendrinos, C. *Co-operation and friendship among scholars in the circle of Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus (1390–1425) as reflected in their autograph manuscripts*, Paper presented at International colloquium *Unlocking the potential of texts: interdisciplinary perspectives on Medieval Greek*, organised by the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities, University of Cambridge, 18–19 July 2006, Cambridge, 2007. URL: [https://pure.royalholloway.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/cooperation-and-friendship-among-scholars-in-the-circle-of-emperor-manuel-ii-palaeologus-13901425-as-reflected-in-their-autograph-manuscripts\(f3fb3f0a-270f-428b-8da0-1f1b33d00c88\).html](https://pure.royalholloway.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/cooperation-and-friendship-among-scholars-in-the-circle-of-emperor-manuel-ii-palaeologus-13901425-as-reflected-in-their-autograph-manuscripts(f3fb3f0a-270f-428b-8da0-1f1b33d00c88).html).

Di Giovanni, M. and O. Primavesi (2016). "Who wrote Alexander's Commentary on *Metaphysics A?* New Light on the Syro-Arabic Tradition". In: *Aristotle's "Metaphysics" Lambda – New Essays. Proceedings of the 13th Conference of the Karl and Gertrud-Abel Foundation, Bonn, November 28th–December 1st, 2010*. Ed. by C. Horn. Philosophie der Antike, 33. Boston and Berlin, pp. 11–66.

Donato, A. (2006). "Aquinas' Theory of Happiness and its Greek, Byzantine, Latin and Arabic Sources". In: *Al-Masâq* 18, pp. 161–189.

Dondaine, A. (1948). "Guillaume Peyraut: vie et œuvres". In: *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 18, pp. 162–236.

Dondaine, A. (1952). "Hugues Éthérieren et Léon Toscan". In: *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* 19, pp. 67–134.

Dondaine, A. (1958). "Hugues Éthérieren et le concile de Constantinople de 1166". In: *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77, pp. 473–483.

Dondaine, H. F. (1949). "Hugues de S. Cher et la condamnation de 1241". In: *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 33, pp. 170–174.

Dondaine, H. F. (1950). "Cinq citations de Jean Scot chez Simon de Tournai". In: *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 17, pp. 303–311.

Dondaine, H. F. (1952). "L'objet et le medium de la vision beatifique". In: *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 19, pp. 60–130.

Dondaine, H. F. (1953). *Le Corpus dionysien de l'Université de Paris au XIIe siècle*. Rome.

Dunn, G. (2006). "Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria, and the Pelagian Controversy". In: *Augustine Studies* 37, pp. 63–88.

Dvornik, F. (1958). "The Byzantine Church and the Immaculate Conception". In: *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: History and Significance*. Ed. by E. O'Conner. Notre Dame, pp. 87–112.

Ebbesen, S. (2001). "Radulphus Brito on the Metaphysics". In: *Nach der Verurteilung von 1277*. Ed. by J. A. Aertsen, K. Emery, and A. Speer. Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 28. Berlin and New York, pp. 456–492.

Ebbesen, S. and J. Pinborg (1981–1982a). "Gennadios and Western Scholasticism. Radulphus Brito's *Ars Vetus* in Greek Translation". In: *Classica et Mediaevalia* 33, pp. 263–319.

El Cheikh, N. M. (2004). *Byzantium Viewed by the Arabs*. Cambridge MA.

Eldarov, G. (1955). "La dottrina dell'immacolata nei maestri francescani e nei teologi palamiti dei secoli XIV–XV". In: *Virgo immaculata: Acta Congressus mariologici-mariani Romae anno MCMLIV celebrati*. Ed. by C. Balic. Vol. 4. Rome, pp. 185–195.

Estangüi Gómez, R. (2014). "Les Tzamplakônes, grands propriétaires fonciers à Byzance au 14e siècle". In: *Revue des Études Byzantines* 72, pp. 275–329.

Estienne, H. (1851–1865). *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae, post editionem anglicam novis additamentis auctum, ordineque alphabeticò digestum tertio ediderunt Carolus Benedictus Hase, Gulielmus Dindorfius et Ludovicus Dindorfius*. First edition 1572. Paris.

Etzkorn, G. J. (2003). "John Pecham". In: *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia and T. B. Noone. Oxford, pp. 384–387.

Eustratiades, S. and monk Arcadios (1924). *Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ μονῇ Βατοπεδίου ἀποκειμένων κωδίκων*. Paris.

Evdokimov, P. (1979). *Orthodoxy*. London.

Failler, A. (2002). "La mission du moine Sophonias en Italie et le mariage de Michel IX Palaiologos". In: *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 60, pp. 151–166.

Faitanin, P. (2002). "La 'haecceitas' en Juan Duns Escoto". In: *Aquinate* 8, pp. 3–14.

Fanelli, M. (2016). "Un'omelia inedita del patriarca Callisto I e l'uso dei testi conciliari foziani nella disputa contro i Latini alla metà del 14o secolo". In: *Revue des Études Byzantines* 74, pp. 171–221.

Farmer, L. L. (1997). "Matter and the Human Body According to Thomas Aquinas". PhD thesis. University of Ottawa.

Fedalio, G. (2007). *Simone Atumano. Monaco di Studio, arcivescovo latino di Tebe. Secolo XIV*. 2nd ed. Brescia.

Fehlner, P. D. (2007). "The Predestination of the Virgin Mother and Her Immaculate Conception". In: *Mariology: A Guide for Priests, Deacons, Seminarians, and Consecrated Persons*. Ed. by M. Miravalle. Goleta, pp. 213–276.

Filovski, J. (1973). "Beleški kon deloto Peri ousias kai energieas od Grigorij Akindin". In: *Živa antika* 23, pp. 33–67.

Filovski, J. and M. D. Petruševski (1973 and 1976). "Grēgoriou tou Akindynou Πραγματεία εἰς τὸ περὶ οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργείας ζήτημα". In: *Živa antika* 23 (36–67, 317–367), 24 (295–331), 26 (161–192, 487–499).

Fink, J. L. (2011). "Pletho's Criticism of Aristotle's Virtues: A Note on *De differentiis* 12". In: *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 51.3, pp. 483–497.

Fisher, E. (1990). *Planudes' Greek translation of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. New York and London.

Fisher, E. (2002). "Planoudes, Holobolos, and the motivation for translation". In: *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 43.3, pp. 77–78.

Flogaus, R. (1996a). "Der heimliche Blick nach Westen: Zur Rezeption von Augustins *De trinitate* durch Gregorios Palamas". In: *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 46, pp. 275–297.

Flogaus, R. (1997a). *Theosis bei Palamas und Luther: ein Beitrag zum ökumenischen Gespräch*. Göttingen.

Flogaus, R. (1998). "Palamas and Barlaam Revisited: A Reassessment of East and West in the Hesychast Controversy of 14th Century Byzantium". In: *St. Vladimir's theological quarterly* 42, pp. 1–32.

Florovsky, G. (1948). "The Legacy and Task of Orthodox Theology". In: *Anglican Theological Review* 31, pp. 65–71.

Florovsky, G. (1950). "The Doctrine of the Church and the Ecumenical Problem". In: *Ecumenical Review* 2, pp. 152–161.

Florovsky, G. (1955). "Typescript of a lecture on *The Vision of Unity*". Florovsky Archive, Princeton University, Box 3, Folder 11.

Florovsky, G. (1976). "Cur Deus Homo?" In: *The Motive for the Incarnation. Collected Works of George Florovsky*. Vol. 3. Belmont, pp. 163–170.

Florovsky, G. (1979). *Ways of Russian Theology*. 2 vols. Collected Works V and VI. Belmont, MA.

Fonkitch, B. (1983). "Заметки о греческих рукописях советских хранилищ 7. Московский автограф Димитрия Кидониса." In: *Памятники культуры. Новые открытия. 1981*. Leningrad, pp. 11–26.

Fonkitch, B. (2002). "Nouveaux autographes de Démétrius Cydonès et de Génnaide Scholarios". In: *Travaux et mémoires* 14. (Mélanges Gilbert Dagron), pp. 243–250.

Franks, C. A. (2008). "The Usury Prohibition and Natural Law: A Reappraisal". In: *The Thomist* 72.4, pp. 625–660.

Fyrigos, A. (2004a). "Tomismo e antitomismo a Bisanzio". In: *Tommaso d'Aquino e il mondo bizantino*. Ed. by A. Molle. Venafro, pp. 27–72.

Fyrigos, A. (2004b). "Tomismo e antitomismo a Bisanzio (con una nota sulla Defensio S. Thomae aduersus Nilum Cabasilam di Demetrio Cidone)". In: *Tommaso d'Aquino († 1274) e il mondo bizantino*. Ed. by A. Molle. Venafro, pp. 27–72.

Gallagher, D. M. (1999). "Thomas Aquinas on Self-Love as the Basis for Love of Others". In: *Acta Philosophica* 8.1, pp. 23–44.

Gamillscheg, E., D. Harlfinger, and H. Hunger (1989). *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600*, 2A–C. Vienna.

Ganchou, T. (2008). "Iōannès Argyropoulos, Géōrgios Trapézountios et le patron crétois Géōgios Maurikas". In: *Thesaurismata* 38, pp. 105–212.

Gardette, P. (2007). "Pour en finir avec Pléthon et son maître juif Elisée". In: *Etudes imagologiques et relations interconfessionnelles en zone Byzantino-Ottomane*. Ed. by P. Gardette. Istanbul, pp. 147–164.

Garfagnini, G. C. (1997). "Paolo Cortesi e i *Libri IV Sententiarum*: una rilettura umanistica di un 'classico medievale'". In: *Medioevo e Rinascimento*, (n. s.) 11, pp. 97–123.

Gauthier, R.-A. (1993). *Saint Thomas d'Aquin. Somme contre les Gentils. Introduction*. Paris.

Geanakoplos, D. (1959). *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258–1282*. Cambridge.

Geanakoplos, D. (1966). *Byzantine East and Latin west: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance*. New York.

Gigante, M. (1981a). "Il latino a Bisanzio". In: *Scritti sulla civiltà letteraria bizantina*. Napoli, pp. 65–101.

Gigante, M. (1981b). "Massimo Planude interprete di Cicerone". In: *Scritti sulla civiltà letteraria bizantina*. Napoli, pp. 105–130.

Gill, J. (1961). *The Council of Florence*. Cambridge.

Gill, J. (1964). *Personalities of the Council of Florence*. Oxford.

Gillet, L. (1983). "The Immaculate Conception and the Orthodox Church". In: *Chrysostom* 6, pp. 151–159.

Glorieux, P. (1934). "Le Commentaire d'Armand de Belvéré sur le 'De ente et essentia'". In: *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 6, pp. 94–96.

Glycofridou-Leontsini, A. (1975). "La traduzione in Greco delle opere di Tommaso d'Aquino". In: *Nicolaus* 3.2, pp. 429–432.

Glycofridi-Leontsini, A. (2003b). "Demetrios Cydones as a translator of Latin texts". In: *Porphyrogenita. Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*. Ed. by C. Dendrinos et al. London and Burlington, pp. 174–185.

Golitsis, P. (2008). *Les Commentaires de Simplicius et de Jean Philopon à la Physique d'Aristote*. Berlin and New York.

Gómez Pérez, A. R. (1982). *El análisis sobre la usura en la "Suma teológica" de Tomás de Aquino*. Mexico.

Gones, D. B. (1980). *Tὸ συγγραφικὸν ἔργον τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου Καλλίστου Α'*. Athens.

Gordillo, M. (1954). *Mariologia orientalis*. Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 141. Rome.

Gordon, B. (1989). *The Economic Problem in Biblical and Patristic Thought*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae IX. Leiden et al.

Gracia, J. J. E. (1994). "Introduction: The Problem of Individuation". In: *Individuation in Scholasticism. The Later Middle Ages and the Counter-Reformation, 1150–1650*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia. New York, pp. 1–20.

Green, B. (2008). *The Soteriology of Leo the Great*. Oxford.

Gründel, J. (1958). "Die Sentenzenglosse des Johanes Pagues (circa 1243–1145) in Padua". In: *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 9, pp. 71–85.

Gutas, D. (1998). *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture: the Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early Abbasid Society, 2nd – 4th / 8th – 10th Centuries*. London and New York.

Gutas, D. (2012). "Arabic into Byzantine Greek: Introducing a Survey of the Translations". In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissenformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 36. Berlin and Boston, pp. 246–265.

Hackett, J. (2003). "Roger Bacon". In: *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia and T. B. Noone. Oxford, pp. 616–625.

Haldane, J. (2010). "Soul and Body". In: *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*. Ed. by R. Pasnau. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Cambridge, pp. 293–304.

Halecki, O. (1930). *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*. Varsovie.

Hankins, J. (1990). "Bessarion's Debt to Proclus in Book II of the *Calumniator*". In: *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*. Vol. 2. Leiden and New York, pp. 441–444.

Hansen, H. (2012). *John Pagus on Aristotle's "Categories". A Study and Edition of the "Rationes super Praedicamenta Aristotelis"*. Leuven.

Harlfinger, D. and J. Harlfinger (1974). *Wasserzeichen aus griechischen Handschriften*. Vol. 1. Berlin.

Hladký, V. (2014). *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon. Platonism in Late Byzantium, between Hellenism and Orthodoxy*. Farnham and Burlington.

Hoennen, M. J. F. M. (1996). "'Aliter autem dicunt Thomistae': Das Prinzip der Individuation in der Auseinandersetzung zwischen den Albertisten, Thomisten und Scotisten des ausgehenden Mittelalters". In: *Individuum und Individualität im Mittelalter*. Ed. by J. A. Aertsen and A. Speer. Berlin, pp. 338–345.

Houser, R. E. (2013). "Saint Bonaventure, 3.2. 'Creation'". In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. First published Tue Nov 1, 2005; substantive revision Wed Feb 27, 2013. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/bonaventure/>.

Hunger, H. (1990b). *Prochoros Kydones' Übersetzungen von S. Augustinus, De libero arbitrio I.1–90, und Ps.-Augustinus, De decem plagiis Aegyptiorum*. Wiener Studien 14. Vienna.

Hussey, J. M. (2010). *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*. Oxford.

Ierodiakonou, K. (2002a). "Psellos' Paraphrasis on Aristotle's 'De Interpretatione'". In: *Byzantine philosophy and its Ancient Sources*. Ed. by K. Ierodiakonou. Oxford, pp. 157–181.

Ierodiakonou, K. (2002b). "The Anti-Logical Movement in the Fourteenth Century". In: *Byzantine Philosophy and Its Ancient Sources*. Ed. by K. Ierodiakonou. Oxford, pp. 221–224.

Ierodiakonou, K. (2011). "The Western Influence on late Byzantine Aristotelian Commentaries". In: *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*. Ed. by M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel. Leuven, pp. 373–383.

Inglis, J. (1999). "Aquinas' Replication of the Acquired Moral Virtues". In: *Journal of Religious Ethics* 27.1, pp. 3–27.

Jackson, D. (2011). *The Greek Library of Saints John and Paul (San Zanipolo) at Venice*. Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies. Medieval Renaissance Texts and Studies, 391. Tempe, Arizona.

Jeauneau, E. (1987). "Le renouveau érigénien du XI^e siècle". In: *Eriugena redivivus. Zur Wirkungsgeschichte seines Denkens im Mittelalter und im Übergang zur Neuzeit. Vorträge des V. Internationalen Eriugena-Colloquiums, Werner-Reimers-Stiftung Bad Homburg* 26.–30. August 1985. Ed. by W. Beierwaltes, pp. 26–42.

Jenson, R. (1999). "Systematic Theology I". In: Oxford, pp. 152–153.

Jokisch, B. (2007). *Islamic Imperial Law*. Berlin.

Jones, D. A. (2012). "Thomas Aquinas, Augustine, and Aristotle on 'Delayed Animation'". In: *The Thomist* 76, pp. 1–36.

Jordanov, I. (2006). *Corpus of Byzantine seals from Bulgaria. II, Byzantine seals with family names*. Sofia.

Jugie, M. (1914). "Georges Scholarios et l'Immaculée Conception". In: *Échoes d'Orient* 17, pp. 527–530.

Jugie, M. (1922). "Homélie sur la Dormition de la Sainte Vierge". In: *Patrologia Orientalis* 16, pp. 567–570.

Jugie, M. (1923–1935). *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium ab ecclesia catholica dissidentium*. 5 vols. Paris.

Jugie, M. (1930b). "Georges Scholarios et Saint Thomas d'Aquin". In: *Mélanges Mandonnet. Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du Moyen Âge*. Ed. by P. Mandonnet. Paris, pp. 423–440.

Jugie, M. (1932). "‘Palamas, Grégoire’ and ‘Palamite, Controverse’". In: *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*. Vol. 11. Paris, pp. 1735–1818.

Jugie, M. (1937). "L’unionisme de Georges Scholarios". In: *Échoes d'Orient* 36, pp. 65–86.

Jugie, M. (1939). "Georges Scholarios, professeur de philosophie". In: *Studi bizantini e neoellenici* 5, pp. 484–494.

Jugie, M. (1941). "Scholarios, Georges". In: *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*. Vol. 14. Paris, pp. 1521–1570.

Jugie, M. (1952). *L’Immaculée Conception dans l’Ecriture sainte et dans la tradition orientale: étude historico-doctrinale*. Rome.

Kadas, S. N. (2000). *Τὰ σημείωματα τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς Ἱερᾶς μεγίστης μονῆς Βατοπαιδίου*. Karyes.

Kaldellis, A. (2007). *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*. Cambridge.

Kaldellis, A. (2015). *The Byzantine Republic: People and Power in New Rome*. Cambridge, MA.

Kappes, C. W. (2013a). "The Latin Sources of the Palamite Theology of George-Gennadius Scholarius". In: *When East met West. The Reception of Latin Theological and Philosophical Thought in Late Byzantium*. London, 11–12 June 2012. Ed. by J. A. Demetracopoulos and C. Dendrinos. Nicolaus 1, pp. 71–114.

Kappes, C. W. (2013b). "The Latin Sources of the Palamite Theology of George-Gennadius Scholarius". In: *Nicolaus* 40, pp. 74–114.

Kappes, C. W. (2014b). "A Latin Defense of Mark of Ephesus at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439)". In: *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 49, pp. 159–230.

Kappes, C. W. (2014c). *The Immaculate Conception: Why Thomas Aquinas Denied, While John Duns Scotus, Gregory Palamas, and Mark Eugenicus Professed the Absolute Immaculate Existence of Mary*. New Bedford.

Kappes, C. W. (2016). "Mark of Ephesus, the Council of Florence, and the Roman Papacy". In: *Primacy in the Church. The Office of Primacy and the Authority of Councils*. Ed. by J. Chryssavgis. Vol. 1. New York, pp. 109–150.

Karamanolis, G. (2002a). "Plethon and Scholarios on Aristotle". In: *Byzantine Philosophy and Its Ancient Sources*. Ed. by K. Ierodiakonou. Oxford, pp. 253–282.

Karayiannis, A. D. (1994). "The Eastern Christian Fathers (A.D. 350–400) on the Redistribution of Wealth". In: *History of Political Economy* 39, pp. 39–67.

Keck, D. (1998). *Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages*. New York and Oxford.

Kesisoglou, A. and G. Papatsimpas (2012). *Αριστοτέλης. Περὶ Ερμηνείας*. Athens.

Kianka, F. (1982). "Demetrius Cydones and Thomas Aquinas". In: *Byzantium* 52, pp. 264–286.

Kianka, F. (1983). "A Late Byzantine Defence of the Latin Church Fathers". In: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 49, pp. 419–425.

King, P. O. (1994). "Bonaventure". In: *Individuation in Scholasticism: The Later Middle Ages and the Counter Reformation*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia. Albany, NY, pp. 141–172.

Kipling, R. (1991). *Something of Myself, and Other Autobiographical Writings*. Cambridge.

Koltsiou-Nikita, A. (1999). "Introduction". In: *Φουλγεντίου Πρὸς Πέτρον περὶ πίστεως*. Ed. by A. Koltsiou-Nikita. Φιλοσοφικὴ καὶ θεολογικὴ βιβλιοθήκη, 40. Thessaloniki, pp. 11–49.

Konstantinou-Rizos, M. (2017). "Prochoros Kydones' Translation of Thomas Aquinas' *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia* and *Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*: Method and Purpose". In: *Never the Twain Shall Meet?* Ed. by D. Searby. Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica, 2, 259–274 in this volume.

Kretzmann, N. (1999). *The Metaphysics of Creation: Aquinas's Natural Theology in Summa contra gentiles II*. Oxford.

Kristeller, P. O. (1985). "Pier Candido Decembrio and His Unpublished Treatise on the Immortality of the Soul". In: *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*. Vol. 2. Rome, pp. 281–300.

Kristeller, P. O. (1993). "Renaissance Platonism". In: *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*. Vol. 3. Roma, pp. 3–20.

Krueger, D. and R. S. Nelson (2017). "New Testaments of Byzantium: Seen, Heard, Written, Excerpted, Interpreted". In: *The New Testament in Byzantium*. Ed. by D. Krueger and R. S. Nelson. Washington, D.C., pp. 1–20.

LaCugna, C. (1991). *God for Us*. San Francisco.

Lagarde, B. (1973). "Le *De differentiis* de Pléthon d' après l' autographe de la Marcienne". In: *Byzantion* 43, pp. 312–343.

Laiou, A. E. (1972). *Constantinople and the Latins. The foreign policy of Andronicus II 1282–1328*. Cambridge/Mass.

Lambros, S. P. (1900). *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*. Vol. 2. Cambridge.

Larchet, J.-C. (2011). *Saint Maxime le Confesseur (580–662)*. Paris.

Laurent, M.-H. (1930). "Armand de Belvèzer et son Commentaire sur le 'de Ente et Essentia'". In: *Revue Thomiste* 35, pp. 426–436.

Laurent, V. (1953). "L'Oeuvre scientifique du R. P. Martin Jugie". In: *Mélanges Martin Jugie, Institut Français D'Études Byzantines*. Paris, pp. 7–32.

Leaman, O. (1988). *Averroes and His Philosophy*. Oxford.

Legrand, É. (1885). *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des grecs au XVe et XVIe siècles*. Vol. 2. Paris.

Lernould, A. (2012). "Nature in Proclus. From Irrational Immanent Principle to Goddess". In: *Neoplatonism and the Philosophy of Nature*. Ed. by J. Wilberding and C. Horn. Oxford, pp. 68–102.

Lewry, O. P. (1981). "Two Continuators of Aquinas: Robertus de Vulgarbia and Thomas Sutton on the *Perihermeneias* of Aristotle". In: *Medieval Studies* 43, pp. 58–130.

Likoudis, J. (2007). "The Mariology of Gregory Palamas". In: *Marian Coredeemption in the Eucharistic Mystery*. Ed. by P. Fehlner. Vol. 6 (Mary at the Foot of the Cross). New Bedford, pp. 139–158.

Lilla, S. (1985). *Codices Vaticanani graeci: Codices 2162–2254 (Codices Columnenses)*. Vatican City.

Livanos, C. (2006a). *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios: "Alone against all Europe"*. Piscataway.

Lobel, D. (2000). *Between Mysticism and Philosophy, Sufi language of religious experience in Judah Ha-Levi Book of Kuzari*. New-York.

Lorentzatos, Z. (1980). *The Lost Center and Other Essays in Greek Poetry*. ET of "Τὸ Χαρέντο Κέντρο", tr. K. Cicellis. Princeton NJ.

Lossky, V. (1944). *Essai sur la théologie mystique de l'Église d'Orient*. Paris.

Lossky, V. (1974a). "Apophysis and Trinitarian Theology". In: *In the Image and Likeness of God*. ET of L'Apophysis et la théologie trinitaire, Paris 1956.

Lossky, V. (1974c). *In the Image and Likeness of God*. Crestwood.

Lossky, V. (1974d). "The Procession of the Holy Spirit in Orthodox Trinitarian Doctrine". In: *In the Image and Likeness of God*. ET of La procession du Saint-Esprit dans la doctrine trinitaire orthodoxe (Paris 1948). Also in *Eastern Churches Quarterly* 7.2 (1948), 31–52. New York.

Lossky, V. (1974e). "The Theology of Light in the Thought of St Gregory Palamas". In: *In the Image and Likeness of God*. ET of *La théologie de la lumière chez saint Grégoire de Thessalonique*, Dieu Vivant 1 (1945), 94–118.

Lossky, V. (1976). *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Crestwood.

Lossky, V. (1978). *Orthodox Theology: an Introduction*. Crestwood.

Lössl, J. (2000). "Augustine in Byzantium". In: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51, pp. 267–295.

Lottin, D. O. (1932). "La composition hylémorphe des substances spirituelles: les débuts de la controverse". In: *Revue néoscholastique de philosophie* 34, pp. 21–39.

Louth, A. (2005). "St. Gregory Palamas and the Holy Mountain". In: *Mount Athos, the Sacred Bridge: The Spirituality of the Holy Mountain*. Ed. by D. Conomos and G. Speake. Bern, pp. 57–58.

Louth, A. (2007). *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681–1071*. Crestwood.

Louth, A. (2013). "The reception of Augustine in Late Byzantium". In: *Nicolaus* 40, pp. 115–123.

Lyonnet, S. (1961). *Le péché originel en Rom 5, 12 et le Concile de Trente*. Rome.

Macé, C., C. Steel, and P. D'Hoine (2009). "Bessarion lecteur du Commentaire de Proclus sur le Parménide. Avec une édition de ses scholies aux livres II et III". In: *Byzantion* 79, pp. 240–279.

Mango, C. (1963). "The Conciliar Edict of 1166". In: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 17, pp. 315–330.

Manoussakis, J. (2015). *For the Unity of All: Contributions to the Theological Dialogue between East and West*. Eugene, OR.

Marchetto, M. (2015). "Nature and Deliberation in Bessarion's 'De natura et arte'". In: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 108.2, pp. 1–18.

Mariev, S. (2013). "Der Traktat *De natura et arte* des Kardinals Bessarion". In: "Inter graecos latinissimus, inter latinos graecissimus": *Bessarion zwischen den Kulturen*. Ed. by C. Märkl, C. Kaiser, and T. Ricklin. Berlin and Boston, pp. 361–389.

Mariev, S. (2014a). "Plethon and Scholarios on Deliberation in Art and Nature". In: *Georgios Gemistos Plethon: the Byzantine and the Latin Renaissance*. Ed. by J. Matula and P. R. Blum. Olomouc, pp. 113–142.

Mariev, S., M. Marchetto, and K. Luchner (2015). "Einleitung". In: *Bessarion, Über Natur und Kunst -- De natura et arte*. Ed. by S. Mariev, M. Marchetto, and K. Luchner. Hamburg, pp. IX–LXII.

Markov, S. (2012). "Theodor `Abû Qurra als Nachfolger des Johannes von Damaskus". In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissenformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. Miscellanea Mediaevalia 36. Berlin and Boston, pp. 111–122.

Martijn, M. (2010). *Proclus on Nature. Philosophy of Nature and Its Methods in Proclus' Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*. Leiden and Boston.

Martin, C. (2014). *Subverting Aristotle: Religion, History, and Philosophy in Early Modern Science*. Baltimore.

Masai, F. (1956). *Pléthon et le Platonisme de Mistra*. Paris.

Masai, F. (1971). "Plethon, l'Averroïsme et le problème religieux". In: *Actes du colloque international sur le néoplatonisme*. Ed. by P. M. Schul and P. Hadot. Paris, pp. 435–446.

Matula, J. (2014). "The Fate of Plethon's Criticism of Averroës". In: *Georgios Gemistos Plethon: The Byzantine and the Latin Renaissance. Acts of the Conference "Georgios Gemistos Plethon: The Byzantine and the Latin Renaissance", Olomouc, 10–12 May 2013*, ed. by J. Matula and P. R. Blum. Olomouc, pp. 293–322.

Mavroudi, M. (2006). "Occult Science and Society in Byzantium: Considerations for Future Research". In: *The Occult Sciences in Byzantium*. Ed. by P. Magdalino and M. Mavroudi. Geneva, pp. 39–96.

Mavroudi, M. (2007). "Late Byzantium and Exchange with Arabic Writers". In: *Byzantium, Faith and Power (1261–1557). Perspectives on Late Byzantine Art and Culture. The Metropolitan Museum of Art Symposia*. Ed. by S. T. Brooks. New Haven, Connecticut, pp. 62–75.

Mavroudi, M. (2013). "Plethon as a Subversive and His Reception in the Islamic World". In: *Power and Subversion in Byzantium. Papers from the 43rd Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 2010*. Ed. by D. Angelov and M. Saxby. Farnham: Publications of the Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 17, pp. 177–204.

Mavroudi, M. (2014). "Ελληνική φιλοσοφία στην αυλή του Μωάμεθ Β'". In: *Byzantina* 33, pp. 151–182.

Mavroudi, M. (2015). "Translations from Greek into Arabic and Latin during the Middle Ages: Searching for the Classical Tradition". In: *Speculum* 90.1, pp. 28–59.

McKenna, J. (2009). *The Eucharistic Epiclesis: A Detailed History from the Patristic to the Modern Era*. Chicago.

Mercati, G. (1916). *Se la versione dall'ebraico del codice Veneto Greco VII sia di Simone Atumano, arcivescovo di Tebe. Ricerca storica con notizie e documenti sulla vita dell'Atumano*. Rome.

Mercati, G. (1920). "Appunti scolari". In: *Bessarione* 36, pp. 109–143.

Mercati, G. (1931a). *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota: ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV*. Vatican City.

Mercier, R. (2003). "The Sources of the Astronomy of Gemistos Plethon". In: *Proceedings of the International Congress of Plethon and His Time, Mystras, 26–29 June 2002, Athens*. Mystras.

Meyendorff, J. (1959b). *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas*. Paris.

Meyendorff, J. (1974a). *A Study of Gregory Palamas*. Crestwood.

Meyendorff, J. (1974b). *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctoral Themes*. Fordham.

Meyendorff, J. (1982). *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church*. Crestwood.

Meyendorff, J. (1983). *Catholicity and the Church*. Crestwood.

Meyendorff, J. (1986). "The Mediterranean World in the Thirteenth Century, Theology: East and West". In: *The 17th International Byzantine Congress: Major Papers*. New York, pp. 669–682.

Miner, R. (2009). *Thomas Aquinas on the Passions*. New York.

Minges, P. (1930). *Ioannis Duns Scoti doctrina philosophica et theologica*. Vol. 1. Ad Claras Aquas (Quaracchi).

Mohler, L. (1923–1942). *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann*. 3 vols. Paderborn.

Mondrain, B. (2004b). "L'ancient empereur Jean VI Cantacuzène et ses copistes". In: *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*. Ed. by A. Rigo. Orientalia Venetiana XVI. Firenze, pp. 249–296.

Mondrain, B. (2007). "Les écritures dans les manuscrits byzantins du XIV^e siècle: quelques problématiques". In: *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 44, pp. 157–196.

Monfasani, J. (1976). *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic*. Leiden.

Monfasani, J. (1981). "Bessarion Latinus". In: *Rinascimento* 21, pp. 165–209.

Monfasani, J. (1984). *Collectanea Trapezuntiana: Texts, Documents, and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond*. Binghamton, NY.

Monfasani, J. (1993). "The Averroism of John Argyropoulos and His *Quaestio utrum intellectus humanus sit perpetuus*". In: *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance* 5. Reprinted as Essay II in J. Monfasani, *Greeks and Latins in Renaissance Italy: Studies on Humanism and Philosophy in the 15th Century*, Aldershot 2004, pp. 157–208.

Monfasani, J. (1994). "Bessarion's 'Οτι ἡ φύσις βουλεύεται (Quod Natura Consulto Agat) in MS Vat. Gr. 1720". In: *Bessarione e l'Umanesimo*. Ed. by G. Fiaccadori. Napoli, pp. 323–324.

Monfasani, J. (2002a). "Marsilio Ficino and the Plato-Aristotle controversy". In: *Marsilio Ficino: His Theology, His Philosophy, His Legacy*. Ed. by M. J. B. Allen, V. Rees, and M. Davies. Leiden, pp. 179–202.

Monfasani, J. (2002b). "Theodore Gaza as a Philosopher: A Preliminary Survey". In: *Manuele Crisolara e il ritorno del greco in Occidente*. Ed. by R. Maisano and A. Rollo. Napoli, pp. 269–281.

Monfasani, J. (2011a). *Bessarion Scholasticus: A Study of Cardinal Bessarion's Latin Library*. Turnout.

Monfasani, J. (2011b). "The Pro-Latin Apologetics of the Greek Émigrés to Quattrocento Italy". In: *Byzantine Theology and its Philosophical Background*. Ed. by A. Rigo, P. Ermilov, and M. Trizio. Βυζάντιος, 4. Turnhout, pp. 160–186.

Monfasani, J. (2012). "Cardinal Bessarion Greek and Latin Sources". In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. Berlin and Boston, pp. 469–480.

Mulchahey, M. M. (1998). *Dominican Education before 1350*. Toronto.

Nadal Cañellas, J. (2006). *La résistance d'Akindynos à Grégoire Palamas: enquête historique, avec traduction et commentaire de quatre traités édités récemment*. Louvain.

Nevitt, T. C. (2014). "Survivalism, Corruptionism, and Intermittent Existence in Aquinas". In: *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 31.1, pp. 1–19.

Nichols, A. (2005). *Wisdom from Above: A Primer in the Theology of Father Sergei Bulgakov*. Leominster.

Nichols, A. (2015). *There Is No Rose: The Mariology of the Catholic Church*. Minneapolis.

Nicol, D. M. (1985). "Review of Prochoros Kydones, Übersetzung von acht Briefen des hl. Augustinus". In: *The Classical Review* 35.2, pp. 428–429.

Nicolet, J. and M. Tardieu (1980). "Plethora Arabicus Identification et Contenu du Manuscrit Arabe d'Istanbul, Topkapi Serai. Ahmet III 1896". In: *Journal Asiatique* 268, pp. 35–57.

Nikitas, D. (1990). *Boethius, De topicis differentiis καὶ οἱ βυζαντινὲς μεταφράσεις τοῦ Μανουῆλ Όλοβάλου καὶ τοῦ Προχόρου Κυδώνη*. Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi, Philosophi Byzantini 5. Athens, Paris, and Brussels.

Nikolaïdou-Kyrianidou, E. (1992). *Ο πολιτικός κατά τον Γεώργιο Γεμιστό-Πλήθωνα. Είναι πλατωνική η κατά Πλήθωνα πολιτική φιλοσοφία*; Athens.

Nikolaïdou-Kyrianidou, E. (2006). "La cité des frères: La polis parfaite de Platon et la Jérusalem du Christianisme". In: *Parenté et société dans le monde grec de l'Antiquité à l'Âge moderne (colloque international. Volos (Grèce) 19–20–21 juin 2003*. Ed. by A. Bresson. Bordeaux.

Noble, S. and A. Treiger (2011). "Christian Arabic Theology in Byzantine Antioch: `Abdallâh ibn al-Fadl al-`Antâkî and his Discourse on the Holy Trinity". In: *Le Muséon* 124.3-4, pp. 371–417.

Noonan, J. T. (1957). *The Scholastic Analysis of Usury*. Cambridge MA.

Noonan, J. T. (1965). "Tokos and Atokion: An Examination of Natural Law Reasoning against Usury and against Contraception; Note". In: *Natural Law Forum* 10, pp. 215–235.

Noone, T. B. (2003). "Universals and Individuation". In: *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus*. Ed. by T. Williams. Cambridge, pp. 100–128.

Oliva, A. (2008–2009). "La Somme de théologie de Thomas d'Aquin: Introduction historique et littéraire". In: *Xύρα. Revue d'études anciennes et médiévales* 7–8, pp. 217–253.

Omont, H. (1888). *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Vol. 2. Paris.

Owens, J. (1994). "Thomas Aquinas". In: *Individuation in Scholasticism. The Later Middle Ages and the Counter-Reformation, 1150–1650*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia. New York, pp. 173–194.

Pagani, F. (2009). "Damnata verba: censure di Pletoni in alcuni codici platonici". In: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 102, pp. 167–202.

Papadopoulos, S. G. (1967e). *Οἱ Ἑλληνικαὶ μεταφράσεις θωμιστικῶν ἔργων: φιλοθωμισταὶ καὶ ἀντιθωμισταὶ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ, συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ιστορίαν τῆς βυζαντινῆς θεολογίας*. Athens.

Papadopoulos, S. G. (1974). "Thomas in Byzanz. Thomas-Rezeption und Thomas-Kritik in Byzanz zwischen 1354 und 1453". In: *Theologie und Philosophie* 49, pp. 274–304.

Pasnau, R. and J. Toivanen (2013). "Peter John Olivi". In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. First published Tue Nov 2, 1999; substantive revision Mon Apr 15, 2013. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/olivi/>.

Pérez Martín, I. (1997b). "El Libro de Actor. Una traducción bizantina del *Speculum Doctrinale* de Vincent de Beauvais (Vat. Gr. 12 Y 1144)". In: *Revue des études byzantines* 55.1, pp. 81–136.

Pessin, S. (2010). "Solomon Ibn Gabirol [Avicebron]". In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. First published Thu Sep 23, 2010. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ibn-gabirol/>.

Pilavakis, M. (1987a). "Markos Eugenikos' 'First Antirrhetic against Manuel Calecas about the Essence and Energy'. Editio Princeps with Introduction and Commentary". Unpublished. PhD thesis. London: King's College, University of London.

Pino, T. A. (2017). "Hylomorphism East and West: Thomas Aquinas and Mark of Ephesos on the Body-Soul Relationship". In: *Never the Twain Shall Meet?* Ed. by D. Searby. Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica, 2. Berlin and Boston, 291–307 in this volume.

Plested, M. (2004). "‘East is East and West is West’: Grace in Augustine and Macarius". In: *Sobornost* 26.2, pp. 24–38.

Plested, M. (2012a). *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*. Oxford.

Podolak, P. and A. Zago (2016). "Ugo Eteriano e la controversia cristologica del 1166: edizione dell’opuscolo ‘De minoritate’. Appendice: edizione della lettera ad Alessio". In: *Revue des Études Byzantines* 74, pp. 77–170.

Podskalsky, G. (1974b). "Die Rezeption der thomistischen Theologie bei Gennadios II. Scholarios (ca. 1403–1472)". In: *Theologie und Philosophie* 49, pp. 305–323.

Podskalsky, G. (1977b). *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz. Der Streit um die theologische Methodik in der spätbyzantinischen Geistesgeschichte (14./15. Jahrhundert)*. Munich.

Podskalsky, G. (2004). *An Outline of Orthodox Patristic Dogmatics*. Rollinsford, NH.

Polemisi, I. D. (2012). *Theologica varia inedita saeculi XIV (Auctores varii, Georgius Pelagonius, Anonymus, Prochorus Cydones)*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 76. Turnhout.

Puntoni, V. (1965). *Indice dei codici greci della Biblioteca Estense di Modena*, Bologna 1896. Vol. 1. Catalogi Codicum Graecorum qui in minoribus Bibliothecis italicis asservantur, 1. Lipsiae.

Putallaz, F.-X. (2003). "Peter Olivi". In: *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia and T. B. Noone. Oxford, pp. 516–523.

Ragia, E. (2013). "Review of M. H. Blanchet, Georges Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400 – vers 1472). Un Intellectuel Orthodoxe Face à la Disparition de l’Empire Byzantin", Archives de l’Orient Chretien 20, Paris, 2008". In: *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 58.1-4, pp. 241–258.

Rigo, A. (1994). "Le opere d’argomento teologico del giovane Bessarione". In: *Bessarione e l’Umanesimo. Catalogo della mostra*. Ed. by G. Fiaccadori. Napoli, pp. 33–46.

Rigo, A. (2004). "Il monte Athos e la controversia palamitica dal concilio del 1351 al Tomo sinodale del 1368: Giacomo Trikanas, Procoro Cidone e Filoteo Kokkinos". In: *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*. Ed. by A. Rigo. Orientalia Venetiana 16. Florence, pp. 1–177.

Rigo, A. (2012). "La teologia di Bessarione da Costantinopoli a Roma". In: *Bessarione e la sua Accademia*. Ed. by A. Gutkowski and E. Prinzivalli. Roma, pp. 21–55.

Rigotti, G. (1994). "Massimo Planude traduttore del De Trinitate di S. Agostino". In: *La traduzione di testi religiosi*. Ed. by C. Moreschini and G. G. Menestrina. Brescia, pp. 185–196.

Risso, P. (1914–1916). "Matteo Angelo Panareto e cinque suoi opuscoli". In: *Roma e l’Oriente* 8, 9, 10, 11, 8 (1914): 91–105, 162–179, 231–237, 274–290, 9 (1915): 112–120, 202–206, 10 (1915): 63–77, 146–164, 238–251, 11 (1916): 28–35, 76–80, 154–160.

Roberg, B. (1990). *Das zweite Konzil von Lyon [1274]*. Paderborn.

Rochette, B. (1997). *Le latin dans le monde grec. Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l’empire romain*. Bruxelles.

Roland-Gosselin O.P., M.-D. (1926). *Le “De ente et essentia” de S. Thomas d’Aquin*. Kain.

Romanides, J. (1989). *Tὸ προπατορικὸν ἀμάρτημα*. 2nd ed. Athens.

Ross, J. (2016). "Elijah Delmedigo". In: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. by E. N. Zalta. Summer 2016 Edition. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2016/entries/delmedigo/>.

Rostagno, E. and N. Festa (1893). "Indice dei codici greci Laurenziani non compresi nel *Catalogo del Bandini*". In: *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 1, pp. 131–176.

Russell, N. (2006). "Prochoros Cydones and the Fourteenth-Century Understanding of Orthodoxy". In: *Byzantine Orthodoxies: Papers from the Thirty-Sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantyne Studies*. Ed. by A. Louth and A. Casiday. Aldershot, pp. 73–84.

Ryder, J. R. (2010). *The Career and Writings of Demetrios Kydones: A Study of Fourteenth-Century Byzantine Politics, Religion and Society*. Leiden.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York.

Sakharov, S. (2008). *Perepiska s Protoiereem Georgiem Florovskim*. Tolleshunt Knights.

Salaville, S. (1924). "Un thomiste à Byzance au XVe siècle: Gennade Scholarios". In: *Echos d'Orient. Revue d'histoire, de géographie et de liturgie orientales* 23, pp. 129–136.

Schmemann, A. (1966). *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*. Crestwood.

Schmitt, W. O. (1967a). "Cato in Byzanz". In: *Klio* 48, pp. 325–334.

Schmitt, W. O. (1967b). "Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz. Die Übersetzungen des Maximos Planudes und die moderne Forschung". In: *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 16, pp. 127–147.

Schönberger, R. et al. (2011). *Repertorium edierter Texte des Mittelalters aus dem Bereich der Philosophie und angrenzender Gebiete. Band III: M–Z. 2. Völlig überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage*. Berlin.

Searby, D. (2012). "Demetrios Kydones: Defending Thomas or Defending Himself?" In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz: Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 36. Berlin and Boston, pp. 439–451.

Searby, D. (2016). "Sophonias". In: *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*. Ed. by R. Goulet. Vol. 6. Paris, pp. 473–477.

Senko, W. (1958). "Les manuscrits des commentaires d'Armand de Bellovisu, de Gérard de Monte et de Jean Verso sur le 'De ente et essentia' de saint Thomas d'Aquin". In: *Mediaevalia philosophica Polonorum* 2, pp. 13–18.

Sherrard, P. (1959). *Greek East and Latin West*. Oxford.

Sherwood, P. (1962). "Byzantine Mariology". In: *Eastern Churches Quarterly* 8, pp. 384–409.

Shezov, V. (2012). "The Burdens of Tradition: Orthodox Constructions of the West in Russia (late 19th – early 20th cc.)". In: *Orthodox Constructions of the West*. Ed. by G. Demacopoulos and A. Papanikolaou. New York, pp. 83–101.

Siniossoglou, N. (2011). *Radical Platonism in Byzantium: Illumination and Utopia in Gemistos Plethon*. Cambridge.

Siniossoglou, N. (2012). "Sect and Utopia in Shifting Empires: Plethon, Elissaios, Bedreddin". In: *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 36.1, pp. 38–55.

Sinkiewicz, R. (1982). "The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God in the Early Writings of Barlaam the Calabrian". In: *Mediaeval Studies* 44, pp. 181–242.

Sinkiewicz, R. (2002). "Gregory Palamas". In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*. Ed. by C. Conticello and V. Conticello. Vol. 2. Turnhout.

Soloviev, V. (1889). *La Russie et l'Église universelle*. Paris.

Spade, P. V. (2008). "Binarium Famosissimum". In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. First published Mon Jul 14, 2003; substantive revision Mon Jun 16, 2008. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/binarium/>.

Speer, A. (2003). "Bonaventure". In: *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia and T. B. Noone. Oxford, pp. 233–240.

Spicq, C. (1930). "L'aumône: obligation de justice ou charité?" In: *Mélanges Mandonnet. Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du moyen âge*. Vol. 1. Bibliothèque thomiste XIII. Paris, pp. 245–264.

Spiteris, Y. (1996). "La mariologia di Gregorio Palamas". In: *Lateranum*, pp. 551–584.

Stegmueller, F. (1935). "A propos du Commentaire d'Armand de Belvézer sur le 'De ente et essentia' de S. Thomas d'Aquin". In: *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 7, pp. 86–91.

Steiner, A. (1933). "Guillaume Perrault and Vincent of Beauvais". In: *Speculum* 8.1, pp. 51–58.

Steiris, G. (2012). "Al-Farabi's Ecumenical State and its Modern Connotations". In: *Skepsis* 22.3, pp. 253–261.

Steiris, G. and N. Lyckoura (2013). "La perception et valorization de la philosophie arabe dans le Résumé de la Somme théologique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin de Georges Gennade Scholarios: les cas d'Avicenne et Averroès". In: *Marges de la Philosophie Byzantine*. Ed. by G. Arabatzis. Athens, pp. 51–74.

Stephanou, E. (1932). "La coexistence initiale du corps et de l'âme d'après s. Grégoire de Nysse et s. Maxime l'homologète". In: *Echos d'Orient* 31, pp. 304–315.

Sternbach, L. (1900–1901). "De Vincentii Bellovacensis excerptis graecis". In: *Ceské Museum Filologické* 6–7, 6:401–416, 7:1–28.

Stump, E. (2006). "Resurrection, Reassembly, and Reconstitution: Aquinas on the Soul". In: *Die menschliche Seele: Brauchen wir den Dualismus?* Ed. by B. Niederberger and E. Runggaldier. Frankfurt a. M., pp. 153–174.

Sullivan, M. B. (2010). "The Debate over Spiritual Matter in the Late Thirteenth Century: Gonsalvus Hispanus and the Franciscan Tradition from Bonaventure to Scotus". PhD thesis. Catholic University of America.

Taeusch, C. F. (1942). "The Concept of 'Usury': The History of an Idea". In: *Journal of the History of Ideas* 3.3, pp. 291–318.

Tambrun-Krasker, B. (2013). "Bessarion, de Trébizonde à Mistra: un parcours intellectuel". In: "Inter graecos latinissimus, inter latinos graeciissimus": *Bessarion zwischen den Kulturen*. Ed. by C. Märkl, C. Kaiser, and T. Ricklin. Berlin and Boston, pp. 1–35.

Täschner, F. (1929). "Georgios Gemistos Plethon, ein Beitrag zur Frage der Übertragung von Islamischem Geistesgut nach dem Abendlande". In: *Der Islam* 18, pp. 236–243.

Tatakis, V. (2003). *Byzantine Philosophy*. Ed. by N. Moutafakis. Indianapolis.

Tavardon, P. (1976). *Commentaire de la logique d'Aristote par Georges Scholarios: les ante-predicaments*. Toulouse.

Taylor, R. (2012). "Aquinas and 'the Arabs': Arabic / Islamic Philosophy in Thomas Aquinas's Conception of the Beatific Vision in his Commentary on the Sentences IV, 49, 2, 1". In: *The Thomist* 76, pp. 509–505.

Taylor, R. (2013). "Aquinas and the Arabs: Aquinas's First Critical Encounter with the Doctrine of Averroes on the Intellect, *In 2 Sent. d. 17, q. 2, a. 1*". In: *Philosophical Psychology in Arabic Thought and the Latin Aristotelianism of the 13th Century*. Ed. by L. X. López-Farjeat and J. Tellkamp. Paris, pp. 142–183, 277–296.

Tinnefeld, F. (1981). *Demetrios Kydones. Briefe*. Vol. 1.1. Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 12. Stuttgart.

Tinnefeld, F. (1985). "Freundschaft und Παιδεία. Die Korrespondenz des Demetrios Kydones mit Rhadenos (1375–1387/8)". In: *Byzantion* 55, pp. 210–244.

Tinnefeld, F. (2002a). "Georgios Gennadios Scholarios". In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition. II: XIIIe–XIXe s.* Ed. by C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello. Turnhout, pp. 479–549.

Tischler, M. (2012). "Eine fast vergessene Gedächtnisspur. Der byzantinisch-lateinische Wissentransfer zum Islam (8.–13. Jahrhundert)". In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissenformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 36. Berlin and Boston, pp. 167–195.

Todt, K.-P. (1991). *Kaiser Johannes VI. Kantakuzenos und der Islam. Politische Realität und theologische Polemik im palaiologenzeitlichen Byzanz*. Würzburg.

Todt, K.-P. (2006). "In Calumniatorem Platonis: Kardinal Johannes Bessarion (ca. 1403–1472) als Vermittler und Verteidiger der Philosophie Platons". In: *Der Beitrag der byzantinischen Gelehrten zur abendländischen Renaissance des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts*. Ed. by E. Konstantinou. Frankfurt a. M., pp. 149–168.

Toniolo, E. M. (2008). "Giorgio (Gennadio) Scholarios (†1472)". In: *Testi mariani del secondo millennio: 1. Autori orientali (secc. xi–xx)*. Ed. by G. Gharib and E. Toniolo. Rome, pp. 565–578.

Triantafyllopoulos, C. (2012). "The Thomist Basis of Prochoros Kydones' anti-Palamite Treatise De essentia et operatione Dei and the Reaction of the Byzantine Church". In: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz: Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen. Akten der 37. Koelner Mediaevistentagung 14.–17. September 2010*. Ed. by A. Speer and P. Steinkrüger. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 36. Berlin and New York, pp. 411–429.

Trizio, M. (2006). "‘Un uomo sapiente ed apostolico’: Agostino a Bisanzio: Gregorio Palamas lettore del ‘De trinitate’". In: *Quaestio* 6, pp. 131–189.

Tsirpanlis, C. (1974). *Mark Eugenicus and the Council of Florence: A Historical Re-evaluation of his Personality*. Thessalonica.

Turner, C. J. G. (1967). "George-Gennadius Scholarios and the Union of Florence". In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 18, pp. 83–103.

Turner, C. J. G. (1969a). "The Career of George Gennadios Scholarios". In: *Byzantion* 39, pp. 420–455.

Tyn, T. (1964). "Prochoros und Demetrios Kydones: der byzantinische Thomismus des XIV Jahrhunderts". In: *Thomas von Aquino: Interpretation und Rezeption*. Ed. by W. Eckert. Mainz, pp. 837–912.

Van Oort, J. (1989). "Augustine on Sexual Concupiscence and Original Sin". In: *Studia Patristica* 22, pp. 382–386.

Van Loon, H. (2013). "The Pelagian Debate and Cyril of Alexandria's Theology". In: *Studia Patristica* 68, pp. 61–84.

Verbeke, G. (1945). *L'évolution de la doctrine du Pneuma, du stoicism à saint Augustin*. Paris.

Versteegh, K. (2013). "History of Arabic Language Teaching". In: *Handbook for Arabic Language Teaching Professionals in the 21st Century*. Ed. by K. Wahba, Z. Taha, and L. England. London, pp. 3–13.

Vicaire, M.-D. (1937). "Les Porrétains et l'avicennisme avant 1215". In: *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 26, pp. 449–482.

Von Grunebaum, G. (1964). "Parallelism, Convergence, and Influence in the Relations of Arab and Byzantine Philosophy, Literature and Piety". In: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 18, pp. 89–111.

Wendebourg, D. (1980). *Geist oder Energie. Zur Frage der innergöttlichen Verankerung des christlichen Lebens in der byzantinischen Theologie*. Munich.

Wendebourg, D. (1982). "From the Cappadocian Fathers to Gregory Palamas. The defeat of Trinitarian theology". In: *Studia Patristica* 17.I, pp. 194–198.

Wippel, J. F. (2000). *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas. From Finite Being to Uncreated Being*. Washington.

Wolter, A. B. (1994). "John Duns Scotus". In: *Individuation in Scholasticism. The Later Middle Ages and the Counter-Reformation, 1150–1650*. Ed. by J. J. E. Gracia. New York, pp. 271–298.

Wood, R. (1996). "Angelic Individuation according to Richard Rufus, St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas Aquinas". In: *Individuum und Individualität im Mittelalter*. Ed. by J. A. Aertsen and A. Speer, pp. 209–229.

Woodhouse, C. M. (1986). *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes*. Oxford.

Wright, C. (2013b). "Towards an edition of Demetrios Kydones's autograph translation of Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*, Prima Pars". In: *When East Met West: The Reception of Latin Philosophical and Theological Thought in Late Byzantium: Acts of the Institute of Classical Studies International Byzantine Colloquium (London, 11–12 June 2012)*. Ed. by

J. A. Demetracopoulos and C. Dendrinos. Nicolaus: Rivista di Teologia ecumenico-patristica 40/1, pp. 19–30.

Yannaras, C. (1971). “Orthodoxy and the West”. In: *Eastern Churches Review* 3, pp. 286–300.

Yannaras, C. (1992). *Ὀρθοδοξία καὶ Δύση στὴ Νεώτερη Ἑλλάδα*. Athens.

Yu, J. (2003). *The Structure of Being in Aristotle's Metaphysics*. The New Synthese Historical Library. Texts and Studies in the History of Philosophy, 52. Dordrecht.

Zavalloni, R. (1951). *Richard de Mediavilla et la controverse sur la pluralité des formes*. Louvain.

Zezes, T. (1988). *Γεννάδιος Β΄ Σχολάριος: Βίος -- Συγγράμματα -- Διδασκαλία*. Ανάλεκτα Βλαστάδων, 30. Thessaloniki.

Index

Note from volume editor: With regard to the orthography of personal names, especially Greek names, in the individual papers, idiosyncracy became perforce the guiding principle. This index is an attempt at standardization, although even here allowances are made for the individual authors' preferences when a name only occurs in one or two places. The series prefers transliterations that are as close to the original as possible, and this principle is more or less adopted in the index. Thus: Kydones, Demetrios not Cydones, Demetrius. When alternative spellings are close (e. g. Planoudes, Planudes), only one entry is given; to facilitate using the index, sometimes alternatives are given (e. g. Cabasilas, see Kabasilas). Emperors and rulers are indexed by first names. Biblical names (Jesus, Mary, Adam, Eve, etc) are not indexed, except in some cases where a prophet or apostle is cited as a source. Only names occurring in the main text are indexed; names cited in footnotes remain unindexed.

Aegidius Romanus 48, 109
Aerts, Willem J. 13
Aimericus 197, 198
Akindynos, Gregory 35, 122, 187, 194
Al-Battānī 313
Al-Farabi 328
Al-Ghazali 317, 327
Alain of Lille 67, 68
Albertus Magnus 47, 48, 72, 103
Alexander III (Pope) 200, 204
Alexander of Aphrodisias 77, 88, 96, 99, 110, 316
Alexander of Hale 71, 299, 300
Amalric of Bena 67
Ambrose 36, 140, 146, 200, 223, 224, 239
Ammonius 98–101, 105, 110
Anastos, Milton V. 309
Andronikos I Komnenos 204
Andronikos II Palaiologos 10, 12, 13, 17, 122
Anselm of Canterbury 16, 116, 230, 241
Anselm of Havelberg 204
Aphrahat 22
Argyriou, Astérios 235, 236
Argyropoulos, John 48, 49
Aristotle 3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 34–38, 47–59, 64, 68–70, 77, 81, 83, 86–88, 93, 95–101, 103, 109–111, 115, 129, 131, 158, 159, 164, 165, 181, 182, 190, 202, 243, 261, 267, 275–277, 280–286, 291–297, 303, 304, 310, 311, 314, 315, 319, 321–328
Arius 36
Armandus de Bellovisu 106, 179, 180, 186–189, 192, 208
Athanasius 36, 65, 198, 199, 201
Athanasopoulos, Panagiotis C. 120, 156, 160, 251
Atouemes, Theodore 121, 122
Atoumanos, Simon 122, 123
Atoumes 117, 121, 123
Augustine of Hippo 10, 11, 14–16, 22, 25–34, 36, 40, 65, 70–73, 116, 146, 200, 208, 209, 211, 213, 215–225, 227, 230–243, 246, 248–251, 260, 261, 270, 272, 319, 324
Averroes 50, 310–317, 319–321, 324–328
Avicembron 52, 327
Avicenna 50, 68–70, 181, 184, 185, 188, 311–315, 317–325, 327, 328
Ayres, Lewis 22
Bacon *see* Roger Bacon
Baiophoros, George 131, 157
Barbaro, Francisco 48
Barbour, Hugh 179, 186, 189, 190, 192, 193
Barlaam of Calabria 23, 34, 64, 78–80, 84, 88, 187, 193, 194
Barnes, Michel 22
Basil the Great (Basil of Caesarea) 35, 36, 67, 130, 131, 134, 146, 147, 149, 238
Bessarion (Cardinal) 77, 78, 81, 84–88, 156, 169, 275–283, 286, 287, 298
Blanchet, Marie-Hélène 151, 152, 154, 156, 160, 240
Boethius (Anicius Manlius Severinus) 11, 12, 16, 99, 116, 261, 270
Bonaventure 52, 56, 57, 72, 232, 297, 299, 300
Bryennios, Gregorios 131, 152
Bryennios, Joseph 147, 208, 235, 236, 244

Bucossi, Alessandra 197, 203, 204
 Buda, C. 118, 119
 Bulgakov, Sergius 24–26, 28, 211
 Burley, Walter 48

Cabasilas *see* Kabasilas
 Calecas *see* Kalekas
 Camariotes *see* Kamariotes
 Cantacuzenus *see* John VI Kantakuzenos
 Carnabaca, Pedro 95
 Charles II of Anjou 13
 Chenu, Marie-Dominique 66, 68, 70
 Chortasmenos, John 37, 122
 Cicero 11, 48, 199
 Constantine XI Palaiologos 95, 96, 314
 Cornelius (Centurion) 139
 Corsini, Pietro 122
 Cortesi, Paolo 47
 Curtius, Ernst Robert 12
 Cydones *see* Kydones
 Cyprian 10, 22
 Cyril of Alexandria 33, 36, 199, 202, 223, 239, 249

Daniel (Prophet) 133
 Delmedigo, Elijah 313
 Demetracopoulos, John 14, 15, 31, 48, 77, 105, 115, 116, 121, 208, 215, 216, 231, 235, 251, 297, 312, 314
 Demetrius of Lampe 197, 198
 Descartes, René 29
 Diocletian 22
 Dionysius (Ps.-Dionyios the Areopagite) 25–27, 54, 57, 65, 67, 68, 70, 72, 135, 201, 232, 234, 315
 Dondaine, Henri 70
 Duns Scotus 27, 28, 38, 48, 77, 80–82, 85, 88, 187, 192, 193, 195, 208–214, 228, 241, 244, 246, 247, 251, 299

Ebbesen, Sten 102, 105
 Elisha (Prophet) 140
 Elissaios (teacher of Pletho) 312, 313, 326
 Ephrem the Syrian 22
 Eriugena, John Scotus 67, 70
 Eustratius of Nicaea 182, 183
 Evdokimov, Paul 212, 213

Fehlner, Peter-Damien 210, 211
 Fichte, Johann Gottlieb 24

Ficino, Marsilio 47, 311
 Flogaus, Reinhard 31, 215, 216
 Florovsky, Georges 26–29
 Fortescue, Adrian 21
 Francis of Mayrone (François Meyronnes) 192, 193, 210, 214, 234, 240, 241, 243, 245, 246
 Fulgentius 219, 220, 241, 251

Ganchou, Thierry 48
 Garnier of Rochefort 67, 68
 Gauthier, René-Antoine 106, 107
 Geanakoplos, Deno 21
 Gennadios II Scholarios 16, 17, 36, 38, 39, 77, 79, 82–84, 88, 93–98, 100–107, 109–111, 129–161, 163, 164, 168–172, 179–181, 183–187, 189, 190, 192, 193, 195, 207–215, 225, 228, 230, 234–251, 276, 309, 310, 312, 314–327, 329
 George of Trebizond 47–53, 57–59, 275, 280, 281, 283–287
 Gibbon, Edward 41
 Gilbert of Porret 67, 68, 70
 Gillet, Lev 212
 Gilson, Étienne 25, 30
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang 63
 Gregory (the Great) 36, 200
 Gregory of Cyprus 32
 Gregory of Nazianz 65, 139, 198, 226, 228, 234, 292, 296, 299, 305
 Gregory of Nyssa 27, 36, 67, 147, 292, 296, 302–304
 Grosseteste, Robert 297
 Guillaume Bernard de Guillac 12

Hagiortes, Nikodemos 14
 Hansen, Heine 106
 von Harnack, Adolf 27
 Hegel, Georg W. F. 24, 41
 Heidegger, Martin 29, 41
 Helena Palaiologina 14
 Helinand of Froimond 67, 68
 Hermogenes of Tarsus 48
 Hilary of Poitiers 36
 Holobolos, Manuel 12, 270
 Hugo Eterianus 197, 198, 202–204
 Hunger, Herbert 15, 270

Jacob of Serrugh 22

Jerome 22, 27, 36, 239
 John Chrysostom 27, 65, 70, 71, 139, 215, 217, 223
 John of Damascus 27, 32, 36, 65, 67, 131, 208, 227, 230–232, 244, 246, 247, 251, 260, 299–301, 305
 John V Palaiologos 14
 John VI Kantakuzenos 13–15, 64, 123, 169
 Jugie, Martin 30, 66, 93, 94, 129, 131, 133, 150–155, 163, 180, 209–215, 226, 231–234, 240, 243, 244
 Kabasilas, Neilos 77, 79, 84, 88, 117, 119, 120, 123
 Kabasilas, Nicholas 147, 213, 219, 231, 233, 234, 236, 237, 242, 250
 Kalekas, Manuel 16
 Kamariotes, Matthew 38, 106, 189, 192, 195
 Kamateros, Andronikos 203, 204
 Kantakuzenos *see* John VI Kantakuzenos
 Khomiakov, Alexei 24
 Kilwardy, Robert 52
 Kipling, Rudyard 21, 22, 30, 41, 197, 202
 Kireevsky, Ivan 23
 Kislas, Théophile 117–119
 Koltsiou, Anna 14
 Koutroubis, Demetrios 29
 Kritoboulos of Imbros 123
 Kydones, Demetrios 12–17, 29, 35, 36, 39, 48, 59, 63, 64, 66, 71, 73, 74, 77, 84, 88, 110, 116–120, 122, 124, 130, 131, 133, 138, 144, 145, 148, 152, 154–156, 159, 163–172, 219, 231–234, 239, 250, 259, 264, 265, 269, 270, 279, 310, 321
 Kydones, Prochoros 12, 13, 15, 16, 65, 116, 160, 167, 169, 259–271, 313
 LaCugna, Catherine 30, 31, 34
 Leo the Great 36, 224
 Leo Tuscus 5, 198, 200, 204
 Livanos, Christopher 213–215, 241
 Loenertz, Raymond-Joseph 14
 Lorentzatos, Zissimos 29
 Lossky, Vladimir 21, 25–28, 30, 31, 34, 35, 211
 Louth, Andrew 21
 Macrobius 11
 Magentinos, Leo 98, 100, 104
 Makarios Makres 208, 234, 235, 245, 251
 Manuel I Komnenos 197–200, 203, 204
 Mark Eugenikos (Mark of Ephesus) 36–38, 77–88, 207, 208, 232, 237, 238, 243, 250, 292–305
 Matula, Jozef 312, 313
 Mavroudi, Maria 312, 313, 328
 Maximos (the Confessor or Homologetes) 31, 32, 65, 70, 211, 217, 218, 220, 223, 224, 228, 235, 243, 302–304
 Megas, Anastasios C. 11
 Mehmed the Conqueror 47
 Mercati, Giovanni 15, 35, 36, 158
 Mercier, Raymond 313
 Metochites, Theodore 122
 Meyendorff, John 28, 30, 31, 34, 73, 212–214, 223, 227, 238
 Michael of Ephesus 181, 183
 Michael VIII Palaiologos 10
 Mioni, Elpidio 121
 Montesquieu 41
 Morrison, Jim 35, 197, 202
 Mourmouris, Nicolaos 95
 Möhler, Johann Adam 24
 Natalis, Hervaeus 193, 261
 Nellas, Panayiotis 29
 de Nerval, Gérard 63
 Nicholas of Cusa 27
 Nicholas V (pope) 49
 Nikephoros Gregoras 32, 35, 64, 123, 328
 Nikephoros Kallistou Xanthopoulos 233
 Niketas of Byzantium 202, 309
 Niketas of Maroneia 204
 Nikitas, Dimitrios 270
 Nissiotes, Nikos 29
 van Oort, Johannes 225
 Origen 225, 300, 303
 Ovid 12
 Pachymeres, George (Georgios) 12
 Pagus, John 71, 102, 106, 107
 Palamas, Gregory (Gregorios) 2–5, 7, 14, 25, 26, 28, 30–35, 37, 40, 41, 63, 64, 66, 73, 74, 194, 208, 211, 215–220, 222–230, 234, 236, 237, 239, 241, 243, 244, 246–251, 259, 260, 296, 328

Panaretos, Matthew Angelos 118–120
 Paul (Apostle) 133, 198, 223, 238, 299, 301
 Pelikan, Jaroslav 21
 Peter Lombard 27, 47
 Peter the Great 23
 Petit, Louis 129
 Philippo de Bindo Incontris 259
 Philotheos (Patriarch) 259
 Photios 23, 202, 203, 214, 215, 241
 Pico della Mirandola 311
 Pinborg, Jan 102, 105
 Pius IX (Pope) 212
 Planoudes (Planudes), Maximos 2, 9–13, 17, 31, 34, 115, 216, 217, 221–224, 234, 243, 246, 249, 250, 270
 Plato 11, 35, 36, 41, 49, 50, 59, 87, 115, 158, 183, 201, 202, 275–278, 280–283, 286, 287, 292, 293, 303, 304, 310–312, 315, 316, 321, 322, 328
 Pletho (George Gemistos) 50, 97, 103, 110, 111, 157–159, 275, 276, 292, 309–314, 326–328, 356
 Plotinos 41, 201, 295
 Plutarch 122
 Podskalsky, Gerhard 17, 35, 129–131
 Porphyry 93–95, 97, 102, 105, 208, 311, 326
 Proklos (Proclus) 98, 278
 Psellos, Michael 98, 100, 104, 105
 Pérez Martín, Inmaculada 13
 Radulphus Brito 38, 83, 94, 98, 102, 105, 106, 109, 110, 208
 Raoul Ardent 67, 68
 Rhadenos of Thessalonike 15
 Riccoldo da Monte Croce 15, 116
 Roger Bacon 52
 Romanides, John 28, 29, 213
 Sabellius 36
 Said, Edward 41
 Schelling, Friedrich 24
 Schlegel, Friedrich 24, 63, 72
 Schmemann, Alexander 211, 212, 292
 Schmitt, Wolfgang O. 9
 Scholarios, George *see* Gennadios II Scholarios
 Scipio (Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus Minor) 11
 Scotus (John Duns) *see* Duns Scotus
 Seferis, George 29
 Sherrard, Philip 21, 29
 Sideridès, Xenophon A. 129
 Simon of Tournai 67, 68
 Simplikios (Simplicius) 87, 278, 311
 Siniossoglou, Nicetas 328
 Soloviev, Vladimir 24
 Sophonias (monk) 13
 Sophronius of Jerusalem 228
 Sophrony (Sakharov), Archimandrite 27
 Spengler, Oswald 41
 Stephanus of Alexandria 99, 100
 Sternbach, Leo 13
 Strategopoulos, Alexios 10
 Symeon of Thessalonica 236, 251
 Tertullian 22
 Themistios 77, 87, 88, 311
 Theodore Gazes 49, 276, 280, 287
 Theodoret of Cyrus 202, 203
 Theodoric 11
 Theophrastus 311
 Thomas Aquinas 13, 14, 16, 17, 24–31, 34–41, 47–53, 56–59, 63–66, 69, 71–74, 78–80, 82–88, 97–99, 101–103, 105, 106, 109, 110, 116–120, 123–125, 129–153, 156–163, 167–172, 179, 180, 184, 186, 189–195, 207–209, 220, 231–241, 243, 245–251, 261, 265–269, 271, 272, 278–280, 283, 285, 291–300, 303–305, 312–328
 Trikanas, Jacob 259
 Tzykandyles, Manuel 120, 168, 169
 Vincent of Beauvais 12, 133
 Voltaire 41
 Ware, Kallistos 29
 Wendebourg, Dorothea 31, 34
 William of Auvergne 69
 William of Moerbeke 49
 Xanthopoulos *see* Nikephoros Kallistou Xanthopoulos
 Yannaras, Christos 21, 29, 214
 Zernov, Nicholas 21
 Zizioulas, John 29